

THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XLV

JUNE, 1947

NO. 1014

German Problems Through German Eyes

JOHN MURRAY, S.J.
Editor of the Month

*Reprinted from THE MONTH**

IN OCTOBER, 1946, the Catholic review, *Stimmen der Zeit* (Voices or Views or Thoughts of the present age), directed by the German Jesuits in Munich, was able to resume publication; it had been suppressed since 1941. I have seen the first three numbers, from October to December.

The history of this review is a fair reflection of the history and difficulties of the Catholic Church in Germany during the past seventy-five years. It began in 1871 as *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, but very soon had to migrate from Germany because of Bismarck's *Kulturkampf* against the Church. For more than forty years it was printed and published abroad

—in Belgium, Luxembourg and Holland. After 1918, it returned to Germany, under its new name of *Stimmen der Zeit*, which it had adopted in 1915. Until 1928, it was a purely Jesuit review, with no outside contributors; but in that year its scope was widened and articles from non-Jesuits were invited and encouraged.

With the advent of the Nazi Government in 1933, it ran into difficulties. It was criticized, watched, admonished. A steady pressure was applied. In Nazi eyes, no circumspection could be sufficiently circumspect, this side of infidelity. Trouble broke out actively as the result of an article by Fr. Overmans (November,

1934), on the July murders, and in 1935, in consequence of an article by Fr. Peter Lippert, the review was suspended for four months. It continued a precarious existence until 1941 when, on April 18, the house of writers in the Veterinarstrasse was entered, searched and requisitioned by the Nazis; the writers themselves were turned out into the street and, one month subsequently, the review was totally suppressed.

FR. ALFRED DELP, S.J.

The October number of the revived *Stimmen* opens with a meditation on the *Our Father*, written in prison by a young Jesuit priest between his death sentence and execution. He was Fr. Alfred Delp, a gifted scholar and writer who, prior to his ordination which took place shortly before the outbreak of war, had published a work called *Tragische Existenz*, a very helpful analysis of the philosophy of Martin Heidegger. He was accused of knowledge of the plot against Hitler of July, 1944, and condemned to death.

His is a moving and eloquent meditation, with an eloquence of atmosphere more than language. "At this supreme moment of my existence"—so begin his reflections on the words and phrases of the Lord's Prayer—"many of the words that were so familiar to my thoughts have lost their significance and value. I no longer want to hear even the sound

of them. All that now appears so far away, so deep beneath me. In my mind, I seem to be sitting high up on a cliff's edge, waiting till someone comes, if someone is to come, to push me over and beyond. High up where I am, time has taken angels' wings. I can hear them beating quietly, very quietly, around me, as though they, too, were hushed in reverent silence before this moment and this place. Beneath me I have the same experience, as of the murmur and purling of a stream within its all too narrow channel. Everything is too narrow, everything too strait for our proper tasks and standards. That was always my secret thought and surmise. Everything far too enclosed, cramped, confined. But to the words which, high up where I now am, retain their meaning and reveal a fresher and a brighter significance, belong the words of the old familiar prayers, before all others the words of that especial prayer taught us by Christ Himself." This series of reflections ought certainly to be translated as a whole.

The December issue contains yet another article by Fr. Delp, written under the same circumstances, on the need of a religious re-education to bring men back to their Creator. In eighteen numbered paragraphs he analyzes the plight of twentieth century man who, he declares, has lost not only the will but even the ability to turn towards God. His language

here is reminiscent of that existential philosophy, of which he had treated in his pre-war book. Man must be awakened and made alive; must be dragged out of that all too close attachment to material things and sub-lunary fears; must become *religiös existent* (religiously alert).

Several articles in these three numbers deserve more detailed comment, since most of them touch upon the domestic situation inside Germany and the problems with which the German people are now faced. One, for instance, discusses the question of Collective Guilt, though more jejunely and formally than one would have liked. Another deals—and admirably so—with the earth-bound and time-limited character of modern thought, of man's frightful and frightening estrangement from spiritual ideas and values and from God, under the title of *Ende oder Wende* ("End or Turning-point"). There are other articles on Racial Doctrines, on the history of Concordats, on Natural Science and charitable relief.

For my purpose two articles stand out as of primary importance. Both are by Fr. Max Pribilla. They are an analysis of the German situation, and still more of how that situation could so develop as it did. The first has the heading, "The Silence of the German People." It contains not much perhaps that is new—at least to those who have followed events in Germany—but it confirms their pre-

vious diagnosis. It is addressed as much to the non-German as the German reader. In one sense, it is an *apologia* for the people of Germany, at least against indiscriminate charges and wholesale condemnation. The second starts with a question, "How was this possible?" a question which is at once title and theme. This is a forthright, indeed scathing, analysis of the German character, an exposure of those traits and tendencies which have permitted such a typhoon of violence and destruction to fall upon Europe and, in the end and most fiercely of all, upon Germany. This article is directed, and very courageously and pointedly directed, to the German reader.

How are we to account for the silence of the German people, he asks, in view of what was happening in the concentration camps, and of the savage ill-treatment of Jews? It would be foolish to take refuge in denials. There are too many witnesses to these atrocities, many of them Germans. The German people, he continues, have not lived a normal life since 1914. Defeat, revolution, insecurity, inflation, unemployment, crisis after crisis—that was their experience between 1918 and 1933. It was out of this bewilderment that the Nazi Party promised to lead them, and its success was due, not to its theories but precisely to these promises, and to the lying propaganda which adapted and adjusted the

promises to the social class or the individual it was trying to win. Then came the Nazi Government or the *Machtergreifung* (seizure of power), to employ their favorite expression; the dissolution of political parties, which offered the merest semblance of resistance; the more protracted struggle to secure control of the police and armed forces (control of the police they soon had; it took longer to control the army, and there they were helped by the political stupidity of some generals with their clumsy attempts to use the Nazis for their own purposes—a game at which they were easily out-maneuvered and outwitted); the building up of a totalitarian State. The Nazis finally had everything in their hands: administration, education, press and propaganda. They laid hold of the law and altered it to suit their theories and convenience. They ruled through secret police and a system of espionage. Children were taught to spy upon their parents and denounce them. No one was safe; the very walls had ears, sometimes the scientific ears of a microphone; there was a *Spitzel* or spy in every house.

Fr. Pribilla does not claim that the German people had no responsibility for this dreadful development. His second article, with which I will deal in a moment, is a stern indictment. He argues that the German people have a very serious responsibility indeed, not so much because of what

they failed to do or attempt after 1933 as on account of their lack of moral fiber and political sense. But here he is asking the foreign reader to imagine what were the conditions in Germany, once the Nazis had secured complete control.

ENSLAVED BY BRUTAL MINORITY

The law had been changed; it no longer protected the citizen against the Nazi Government or Party. Each Gauleiter, indeed every minor official, could play the tyrant in his own manner, certain of Party backing. The courts could do nothing for a man, once the Gestapo had marked him down; even when they could frame no charge against him, he might be whisked off into "protective custody." A veil of secrecy was drawn over Nazi proceedings. No one knew precisely what lay behind them. A knock on the house door in the early morning might mean that the Gestapo had come to arrest some member of the family or to hand back to a wife the ashes of a husband, arrested a week before. Happy that land where a knock on the door in the early dawn brings with it no gasp in the throat, no clutching of hands! Indeed, a democratic country has been described as one where you may hear a knock on the front door in the early morning and know it is only the milkman or the paper-boy. But it was originally through a cunning exploitation of democratic procedure that this tyr-

anny established itself. On this point, Fr. Pribilla makes the significant remark, which is as valid of Communists as ever it was of the Nazis: "The Nazi experiment was a thoroughly dishonest and dishonorable business. It strangled democracy with democracy's own freedom of speech and action, and then it built up the government of a brutal minority."

EXAMINATION OF CONSCIENCE

Returning to the problem of the German people's *silence*, he states that the people did know there were concentration camps. They had no contact with them, for the camps were isolated and self-contained. No visits were tolerated either for personal purposes or for general inspection. Criminals were cunningly mixed with political prisoners, so that it was difficult to decide how much was genuine prison, and how much concentration camp, in the political sense. The German people knew something; suspected more; were afraid to enquire further. It was not a noble attitude. So much is granted. But what was the alternative? He claims that, once the Nazi administration was established, there was no alternative. Open opposition would have been crushed at once. It would have made martyrs, and indeed there were some such martyrs. But no appeal to law or justice was possible; the way was barred. So, they took refuge in silence—some, because of hopelessness,

some because of fear, others, only too ready to acclaim success, to be lackeys of the men with power.

Fr. Pribilla naturally maintains that the only consistent opposition to the Nazis, on the plane of ideas and beliefs, was that of the Christian churches, especially of the Catholic Church. So much scarcely required saying. Bishops insisted again and again on the teaching of the Church in its opposition to the theories of the Nazis. Again and again did they protest against the Nazi interference with the Church's liberty. Yet even here, Fr. Pribilla has a criticism to bring forward. He allows that many German Catholics did not realize the incompatibility of Nazi and Catholic doctrines, that many paid some lip-service to Nazism for fear of being accounted anti-national, and that some compromised on the grounds that they could thus exercise a moderating influence within the Nazi Party. The protest of the various Christian bodies, thinks Fr. Pribilla, was neither so clear nor so energetic as we now, looking back upon events, would like it to have been. A more vigorous protest from the Christian side would, in all probability, have made not the slightest difference, but it would have at least been a worthy Christian witness. Christians were inclined to postpone resistance until, as they said, it was perfectly clear they were being attacked. But by the time they woke to the necessity for

such resistance, they were already outflanked and enfiladed.

Fr. Pribilla's second article is an appeal to Germans to examine their consciences. Too many are refusing to face realities, will not go through this very necessary procedure of heart-searching. Benumbed or bewildered, they are silent, thinking only of immediate needs and questions. But Fr. Pribilla will not let them dodge these straight questions: How was it that *you* accepted and applauded Hitler as a great leader—a man who was "great" only in the measure of his insanity? How was it that *you* took such pride in a government of maniacs and scoundrels? It is not so much Hitler and the Nazis who are the problem, as the ease with which they came to power and retained it.

The question receives its reply in an analysis of the German character and experience, which is blunt and trenchant. It cannot have been easy for a German to write, as it will not prove pleasant reading for German eyes.

In the first place, asserts Fr. Pribilla, the Germans are politically immature. They have not the subtlety or the balance that politics demand. Where ends are concerned, they are not practical men; they dream too much, they lose themselves in vague and loose ideas. The very fear of their own dreams makes them accept too willingly authority and discipline.

Yet they have great gifts for organization. Show them a clear *goal*, and they will set about providing the *means*, very efficiently indeed, for reaching it. They are practical with *means* and *methods* but unpractical in judging what is or should be the *end*. The strength of the Germans lies in *Ausführung*, not in *Führung*, that is in execution and not policy.

Another sign of political immaturity in Germany can be seen in the choice of means, when they enter into personal relationships. There is a proverb that, if a man is polite, the German thinks he must be telling lies. Too readily do they fall back upon a rough and assertive manner, as though a milder attitude would not be treated seriously. They are impatient; they require an instant answer, an immediate solution. For them it is hard to wait attendance upon the favorable moment; they lack respect for things and situations. Their anxiety is to cut rather than untie the Gordian knot, regardless of the rough ends they will leave. With this goes an inability to see the point of view of others. There is a little understanding of others as respect for them. Hence the German tendency to push things to extremes, to drive through all opposition. Despite much study of other countries and their peoples, the German is a bad psychologist.

Next to this political immaturity, Fr. Pribilla emphasizes the absence

of civil courage among Germans. They are brave soldiers—not a doubt about that. Under authority, they are splendid. Left to themselves, they are timid and lost. They can never have enough commands, or direction. Even civilian life is dominated by uniform, and uniform has always the same paralyzing effect; it depersonalizes the wearer and makes him a tool or instrument of his office. Fr. Pribilla stresses the *Beamtentum* of so many Germans. They are *officials by character*, ready to carry out instructions, but incapable of acting on their own. With this, a tendency to cling to their jobs and posts, to make themselves amenable, at times subservient, to superiors, and to do nothing that will interfere with promotion. This official mind readily excuses itself from the necessity of asking about the morality of the commands imposed upon it. Consequently, it was an apt instrument of Nazi tyranny. Fr. Pribilla considers that much of this mentality is due to the German system of education, with its insistence upon military qualities, on order, regularity and obedience.

He suggests a third deficiency in the German character, which at first hearing might sound preposterous. They lack, he declares, a proper community sense or spirit. Yet there is no people that coheres more closely, under discipline. Precisely, Fr. Pribilla would reply. But remove that

discipline, and the Germans remain isolated. Impose that discipline, in a contrary sense, that is against their neighbors, and they will act with a disciplined lack of feeling for others. Each for himself, every man saving his own skin. Before and after 1933, Germany was betrayed by individuals and groups—by financiers, generals, trade unions—each individual or group playing his or its own game. The Nazi policy—this was clear enough in its piecemeal attack upon the Church—was always, *Divide et impera*. They succeeded in the policy of *impera* because the people were so divided.

EFFECTIVE CHRISTIANITY ABSENT

Finally, Fr. Pribilla insists that there was a great absence of living, effective Christianity in Germany. In wide sections of the German people there was a vacuum, a spiritual vacuum, into which the fanaticism and violence of Nazism found easy entrance. What he here says of Germany, might be said of other European countries, though nowhere else to the west of Russia did it find so noisy and ruthless an anti-religious reaction. "The sword of the spirit had grown dull and blunt in German hands, and so there broke in those hands the sword of iron, which they had wielded not in the service of the spirit but in that of brute power. And the culture of the German people, which had its roots deep in Chris-

tianity, was brought low, with all its grand achievements and heritage, because it was repudiated and denied, and because those who ought to have maintained it had not the courage to make those sacrifices that were necessary for its defence. It will always remain a matter of urgent reflection that the most frightful disasters—

military, political and moral—that ever fell upon the German people coincided with their explicit and deliberate rejection of Christianity."

These are fine articles, written with a sincerity that is patent and a courage one must needs admire. It must have cost Fr. Pribilla a great deal to write them.

True Democracy

If our America is to solve the complicated and baffling problems which today create stress and strain within the nation; if our America is to achieve and preserve a truly democratic way of life; if our America is to fulfill her proper responsibilities as a member of the family of nations, the first requirement is the rediscovery of her own soul.

From the very outset, the fabric of the Republic has rested upon the sure foundation of natural law and of religious faith conceived in the liberty of the Judeo-Christian spiritual tradition. There is today a supreme need for the renewal within the minds and hearts of our people of the simple but adequate religious faith which inspired our Colonial leaders and constituted the chief source of the driving energy of the founders of the American belief in democracy, in the basic principles of liberty under law, of rational tolerance, and of the practical possibility of advance in human welfare. This is the root of the American dream and the sanction for American idealism.—

From statement issued by the National Religious Council of Common Cause, New York, N. Y., April 6, 1947.

Art—And All That

ROBERT B. HEYWOOD

*Reprinted from TODAY**

EVERYONE philosophizes about Art. That isn't all: everyone absolutizes about art. In a realm in which there are possibly fewer absolutes than in any other form of philosophy, each man is his own "philosopher-king."

We like what we like because we like it. This is the greatest truth, and it is expressed in all kinds of ways. We may simply dismiss a work of art with a bold "Doesn't suit my taste." Or—if we know a little Latin—we might elaborate enough to dig up "De gustibus non disputandum est" (whether we put the "est" in the middle or at the end). Just murmur any old cliché about taste and you put an end to all discussion, consideration, evaluation, response or vision.

Everyone moralizes about art. You cannot possibly object, for example, to a really objectionable piece of Church art—which it's a sticky statue or a hymn-tune more suitable to the bar-room than to the house of God: you can't possibly object to these things because someone will be sure to remind you: "After all, look at the good these things are doing for people."

The pious thoughts which even the worst works of art supposedly evoke are taken as sufficient justification for any outrage in the realm of art. Yet, if it takes inferior music, inferior painting, inferior sculpture to elicit the proper sentiments from us, perhaps we should take this as a rather damning comment on the state of our spirituality.

Not always has it been the case that the arts of the Church had to be vulgarized to meet popular or commercial demands. There were times, even, when artists and craftsmen made great things, beautiful things, because they were right and fitting for the house of God. Men still sometimes worked for the good of the work to be done and the glory of God.

Now, all too often, it is only the machine which works for the glory of the ecclesiastical barter shop and the stupefaction of the people. Long since, the idea of the "good of the work" has been abandoned; and one of these days we are going to be frank enough to revise our terminology about art, admitting that it is really the "devious indetermination of work half-done"—rather than

"the undeviating determination of work to be done" (as the old Schoolmen used to put it.)

In fact, the whole situation is depressing; and we purposely make the picture as dark as possible (disremembering that there are, here and there, signs of good hope) in the wish that the expression of our outrage and our gloom may cause a few to re-examine and re-evaluate their whole response to works of art.

REQUIREMENTS

If we would be willing to set aside a few of our precious prejudices, our stately sureness, our blinding predispositions: then there might be some chance. Yet, unless we are willing to remove our philosopher-king crowns, there is no opportunity at all of understanding art—much less of understanding art in its many and subtle human relationships.

If, though, we are willing to step down from our thrones and walk in the road of real people, grappling with real philosophical problems and faced with real works of art: then there is some chance that we may understand the grandeur, the mystery, and the splendor of art.

However, before any kind of philosophical thought is even possible about art, we have to clear our dispositions. Really, what is needed is a kind of psychological cross-examination of our motives, our demands and our responses.

Before it is possible to say what a thing of beauty is, we have to answer two very puzzling questions: 1) What do we expect from a work of art? 2) What does a work of art expect from us?

Answering these two questions won't solve all our problems about art; but an honest response to these two questions may open our minds sufficiently to allow us to ask the right questions and know what the real problems are.

What do you look for in a work of art? What do you expect from a work of art? This may sound like a rather silly question, but it has to be answered because so many of us expect such diverse things, and each of us feels that if his particular expectation is satisfied that the work is justified.

Now, let's see. Do you look for something which will excite you? Do you think, for instance, that a work of art should call forth an emotional excitement which nothing else can elicit?

Or, do you think that a work of art should edify you, instilling in you noble and pious thoughts which nothing else can call forth? When you see a picture or listen to a piece of music or read a poem, do you expect that you will be raised, afterward, to a new level of spiritual experience? Do you expect that the experience of a great work of art will make you a better human being?

For, isn't it true that the experience of the beautiful should also make you good?

Or, do you look for a great truth in a work of art? (For the beautiful is also true!) Do you expect from art some truth which you could find nowhere else? Perhaps in the realm of art you will enter, at long last, a realm of pure absolute, solving and discovering some truths which never have been known before.

Or, maybe you have the thought that art will provide a substitute for religious experience, replacing or displacing religion. Many have fled into the religion of poetry; others have made poetry out of religion.

Or, do you expect a great work of art to be an exact copy of something in Nature? Do you demand that the painter be a photographer? Is your qualification for a work of art that it be "big as life and twice as natural?"

Or, maybe (and this is my most fantastic proposal) you have some idea that art will take the place of love in your life. Many another has thought this, thought that if the inner-sanctuary of the world of art could be reached there would be no need for more basic human considerations.

These alternatives have, purposely, been made as spectacular as possible. Obviously, all of us don't go to such extremes in our response to a work of art: yet in all of our responses

may be some elements of these exaggerated positions. By means of over-emphasis we may be able to clear the air of a lot of nonsense about art.

In the first place, don't expect that art will be something which will excite you. Sometimes it will! But when it does, this is a good sign that you should pause rather thoughtfully and say: "Now what was it that so excited me? Is it the work of art, or is it something which is quite outside the realm of art?"

I have known people, for instance, who actually go into a swoon when they listen to the music of certain romantic composers; but if you stop them and say: "Now see here, just what is it about this music which makes you react so unnaturally," they are really at a loss to know what to say.

Indeed, art is (as St. Thomas says) supposed to "please," but the "pleasure" which we get from a work of art is not supposed to be a substitute for any of the other pleasures—either natural or supernatural! A friend of mine always talks about the music of a great high-Romantic composer as being "a substitute for sex and religion." If you are expecting that art can do anything as drastic as that, then you are sure to be deceived.

Or, in the second place, if you think that a world of art will make you a "better human being" you are in for a shock. It may happen, and

I hope it will, that the experience of a great work of art will open new vistas and reveal new worlds to you; but do not expect this because it would be presumptuous.

Because of the state of fallen human nature, the experience of some works of art may actually make you a worse human being. For the artist, sometimes, finds it necessary to deal with the whole problem of evil—a fact which gives rise to the great and subtle problem of the relationship between art and prudence.

If all works of art made "better human beings," then all works of art would be for all people. But it is perfectly clear that works of art (like wines) are made for people with varying degrees of sensibility—and susceptibility. A work of art which may make a "better human being" out of one person may make a very much worse human being out of another.

Sadly it is true that some great artists are touched with the flower of evil; sometimes they have seasons in hell and visions of the underworld—visions which may not be fruitful for every human being to experience. This in no sense necessarily means that the artist is wrong; it merely means that some of us are made for stronger stuff than others.

Often the artist (this would seem especially true in the novel) has to deal with raw materials which are not necessarily pretty. In treating

of fallen humanity, with all its sinfulness, the artist may (if he is a great and subtle artist) be able to show us something of redeemed, renewed humanity. Even through evil we may be able to see the good; through the crooked lines we may see the straight. Yet in some cases we may have to say—in all simplicity and humility—"this wine is too strong for me: maybe not for others, but for me."

TRUTH IN ART

Then, do you look for great "truth" in art? If so, you may be on the right track; for there is a certain kind of truth in every genuine work of art. I hasten to add, though, that this is not necessarily the same kind (though often it coincides) of truth which you will get from philosophy or revelation.

Artistic truth, which is found in a certain conformity of the work of art with the artistic idea, is something different from metaphysical or theological truth. Very often the greatest artists have displayed in their works great philosophical and—even—theological truths; but we cannot always insist on this kind of truth.

Expect truth, indeed, from a work of art; but expect that it will be the artist's own truth, the truth of the being of a created work. There is surely great meaning in the definition of beauty as the "splendor or truth"; but I think we need to remind our-

selves that the kind of truth which the work of art expresses may not be of exactly the same kind as the rigorous, logical truth of discourse and dialectic.

Next, this difficult question about the "religion of poetry." It has been easy for so many to slip into this particular fallacy.

Men look around them and see all kinds of human frailty and vulgarity, and (particularly if a person is very sensitive) it is very easy to decide: "Well, after all, all these things are imperfect; there is no hope in society, no hope in philosophy, and no hope in religion—after all, all the religions are always fighting with one another—so I will take my refuge in this more perfect world of art, where at least I can have the satisfaction of contemplating the perfection of human creation." When such an attitude is even hinted, it is time to beware of mixing your poetry and your religion.

The greatest danger is, of course, to make a religion out of poetry; but there is a more insidious conspiracy which is to make poetry out of your religion.

If you can only worship under the most perfect conditions: let us say the purest Gothic architecture, dim religious light, vestments of just the right texture, music of just the right period; if you need all these things (mind you, I don't say they aren't desirable!) before you can worship:

then you are making too much of the poetry of religion.

Indeed, the Church has always utilized genuine poetry in the worship of God. Things of beauty have always had a great role in the life of the Christian. The whole point is that we should be ready to love the mystery more than the splendor, love the reality—with all its failings and human weaknesses—more than everything: because the Christ who lives in the Church is also Christ crucified.

If you expect art to be a slavish imitation of nature, then you are asking the wrong thing. Indeed, art does—always and in different ways—have certain "imitative elements." But if we exaggerate the place of imitation, then we make art a travesty and—in a way—a blasphemy.

If you want the artist to be a mere photographer or reporter, then better be completely honest and dispense with any pretense that the work of art has a being and a meaning which is greater than that of mere mechanical representation or duplication. If the artist is interested only in copying nature as it is, then art would be superfluous and the artist's function would be, at best, purely mechanical.

The best works of art would then be the masterplasters with real glass eyes, real clothing and real hair! Art is something much more than this, and the great artists have always used the things of nature: but

they have given them new, significant form and meaning. The artists have in a certain way continued the process of creation, not copied the created thing.

LOVE

Finally, there is the question about art and love. In a world in which all values are mixed up, it is not surprising that, in the minds of some, art should be looked upon as a substitute for such a basic human value as love.

In its most primitive form this kind of reaction to art is exemplified in the "swoon" reaction to music — whether it is in response to Wagner or Frank Sinatra. Yet, just as art cannot be a substitute for goodness or truth, it cannot be a substitute for love.

We can and should "love" the thing of beauty—whether it is the work of the human artist or the Artist of Creation; but such "love" must be placed in the proper hierarchy of values. "When the evening of life comes, you will be judged on Love." I'm sure that St. John-of-the-Cross didn't mean that we would be judged on our love for created beauty alone.

After such an elaborate explanation of what not to expect from art, you might well wonder what you could rightfully expect. And the answer is not as easy as the question. To some degree, you can expect something of all the things we have told you not to expect.

In any given work of art you may find some excitement, some edification, some truth, some sense of the spiritual, some imitation of nature, and some lovable reality. Yet, do not expect these things. Do not demand them!

Rather, look for being. Try to understand—on its own terms if you will—the reality of the thing of beauty. Perhaps some of these other things will be added unto you. But if you do not try to apprehend the being of a work of art, what makes it genuine and not fake, you will be misled and deluded.

If I could rephrase Erie Gill's famous maxim about art, I would say: "Look after being and the rest will take care of itself."

We can hope that a work of art will please us emotionally, give us some great truth in a special way, and—even—give us some significant "message" or "excitement." We can look—to some degree at least—for any of the elements we have mentioned; but we should not expect or (much less) demand that a work of art give us these things. (Or worse, we shouldn't choose one of the elements and make it the decisive basis for our judgments of works of art.) If we are in a position to make any demands upon a work of art; it is not inappropriate to turn the tables and ask ourselves what a work of art can expect from us.

The Ford Election

*Reprinted from THE WAGE EARNER**

THE victory of a pro-Communist slate in Ford Local 600 UAW-CIO continues to be a source of wonder to those inside and outside the labor movement who do not understand what makes working guys tick.

Actually, there is no mystery about it at all.

The simple fact is that workers do not elect their leaders upon ideological grounds. They make their decisions upon very practical economic considerations. All the talk in the world about what Russia has done in Poland will not get you many votes if the workers are convinced that they have been doing pretty well on wages and working conditions.

The world-wide Communist conspiracy, the possible danger to our country, the big struggle in the United Nations—these things are not regarded by the worker as important issues in the operation of his local union.

What happened in the Ford Local is just this: the anti-Communists failed to demonstrate that there was any good, practical economic reason why the present leadership should be thrown out.

This failure had many complex reasons. One reason was the fact that the head of the pro-Communist ticket is not a Communist himself, and is known to have had many disagreements with them. Leaders in such a position may be justly accused of playing politics with the welfare of the workers—but they cannot be thrown out merely by pointing to the concentration camps in the Soviet Union.

Voters in civil politics act in the same way. A corrupt political machine that gets Uncle Billy out of jail when the cops pinch him, that fixes the streets in front of the right houses, and that passes out jobs where they are needed, will triumph time and again over a reform ticket which merely appeals to the conscience of the voters on high civic grounds.

Such a machine is defeated only when the opposition demonstrates that the streets are going to heck, that Citizen Jones is likely to be

* 58 West Adams St., Detroit 26, Mich., April 11, 1947

jailed without charges by the machine's cops, that the treasury is being plundered, that taxes are too high and benefits too low.

The right way to clean the Communists out of the labor movement is demonstrated by Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union. Curran was once a "fellow-traveler" who thought he could use the Communist Party. He has now discovered that the Communist Party is using the National Maritime Union.

Unlike some of the boys, Curran has shown himself big enough, tough enough and loyal enough to his workers, to reverse his stand, admit his mistake and make a fight.

But Joe Curran is not making his fight by pointing to Moscow or Azerbaijan or some other place far removed from the experience of his people.

Joe Curran is pointing to the waterfront, showing his members how Communist control costs them jobs and wages, how the Commies are plotting a hasty and dangerous strike in June, how their bread-and-butter depends upon getting rid of these "political gangsters."

Joe Curran is winning. He is winning with the only methods which will ever succeed in getting the Communists out of the labor movement.

The anti-Communists in Ford Local 600 have a good and sound case. Communist control is fatal to the interests of the workers who pay the dues. The record clearly shows that Communists regard the workers' welfare as a means to an end, not as an end itself.

But these facts will not demonstrate themselves. They must be made clear to the rank-and-file. When they are not made clear, the result is what happened at Ford's.

*

Excess Baggage

Catholics who regard the prevailing confusion with a defeatist attitude are perhaps few, but are there not many who are indifferent, not to say selfish? They content themselves with the comforting assurance that the Church, at any rate, is indefectible, and they become still more individualistic—they are in the barque of salvation, why worry about the flood-waters without?—The IRISH WEEKLY AND ULSTER EXAMINER, March 8, 1947.

A Family Bill of Rights

EDWIN McDERMOTT, S.J.

*Reprinted from WESTERN JESUIT**

LIKE great engineers, Messrs. Marshall, Bevin, Molotov and Bidault are trying to span the gap between nations with a lasting bridge of peace. In secret councils and general assemblies, men from many countries are busy drawing up blue-prints to prevent future wars and insure international order. But you and I know that all such blue-prints are as useless for the purpose as blue paint unless they conform with the plans of Him Who first drew this world out of chaos and blessed it with order. So it is with the family.

ARTICLE I. The family is the natural unit of society, instituted by God for the generation of children and the perfection of all its members by mutual aid and love.

God's plan began with the family. He didn't build the world, people it with men and women, divide it into nations, and then as an afterthought, sort out groups into families. God created man and woman and bade them to project their love in the generation and formation of children. This is the family: "It's you and me and ma and pa." In the hearts of its members there is a God-given instinct

to mutual cooperation, understanding and love.

The family is not very complicated, but it is so important to the well-being of the nation that we can say that the U.S. cannot defend the bridge of peace until it defends the family—your family and mine, and the family across the backyard fence. And the U.N. cannot protect the bridge of peace until it protects the families of Yugoslavia, France, Estonia, China and Russia.

ARTICLE II. The family will reach its full perfection only if it is directed to God, as its last end. Hence the family has the primary duty of worshipping God and the inalienable right to fulfill this duty.

Before talking about duties, let me tell you about apples. I like apples, so I planted a little tree in a sunny spot near the house. I cared for it, watered it, protected it from gophers and gardeners. When finally the tree had little apples, then big ones, I felt almost an absolute dominion over this fruit. I felt the tree had a duty to give me fruit because of all my care.

Our families are something like that apple tree. We're hedged about with God's protection, we're watered

with His gifts of nature and of grace. He has given everything; in a very real way, then, He demands that we give Him fruit. Our fruit towards God is our worship, our prayer, our trust in Him, our acknowledgment of our absolute dependence upon Him.

Needing us not, God has nonetheless lavished his blessings upon us. All the members of the family, therefore, owe Him a great debt, in fact, a double debt: one because they are alive; the other because they are a father or a mother, a son or daughter, a sister or brother—a part of a family. And because they have this duty, they have the right, as individuals and as a family, to render homage to God, a right no man can take from them.

That is why the Church suggests ways of paying not only our individual debt, but also our family debt to God. Who has not seen an entire family kneeling, side by side, in a pew at Sunday Mass or walking up the aisle together to Holy Communion? This is family life in Christ.

Who has not seen the family debt to God balanced by the virtue of "family trust?" Even Karl Marx would have trusted in God, if he could have knelt down, as I have, before a little statue of Mary and repeated the Glorious Mysteries of the Rosary with a young mother and father. They held the beads of Mary in one hand and restrained the wig-

glings of their little son with the other. The Family Rosary makes two crowns: one for Mary, one for the family.

St. Augustine has called the home, "a little church." This is no exaggeration when we witness the Act of Consecration of the family to the Sacred Heart. I recall the night I accompanied a priest to six homes for this ceremony. We knelt on plush carpets and we knelt on threadbare rugs; we saw small families, and one with ten children; we prayed with the rich and with the poor. But in every home we noticed that two things were sure to be found: a loving family and devotion to the Sacred Heart. Talking it over on the way home, we came to the conclusion that the two things were really only one: loving families in the Sacred Heart.

Although worship of God is a sacred duty of every family, a duty begotten of its very creaturehood, it is at the same time the prelude to yet other tremendous benefits, just as the duty of going to Mass brings with it the glorious privilege of partaking of the Banquet of Holy Communion. The family that worships God with living faith is the family beloved of God.

ARTICLE III. To achieve its God-appointed goal, the family has fundamental rights which the State must respect and defend, such as the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

freedom of conscience, inheritance of family goods, the education of the children in their intellectual and moral life, a family living wage, and an equitable share of tax monies for the schooling of its children.

These rights are God's sign and seal, approving and protecting His institution, the family. They become for us inalienable claims to security, sustaining our independence as branches of a tree sustain the fruit. There is no question here, however, of saving family rights alone. For rights are branches not roots. The roots of the family are to be found in its dependence on God. To attempt to save the family rights alone would be like trying to save the dome of the National Capitol without the foundation. First save the foundation, and we will have the dome; so too, first preserve worship of God as the basis of our rights and we will have the family. Then the family can save the world.

Among the rights mentioned above, one calls for special emphasis, the fact, namely, that the parents are the primary educators of the child. Whether the child is learning the *ABC's* or the *Our Father*, his first teachers are his mother and father. They are always his teachers, even when they send the child to school. They always have the right to direct his education, especially in the selection of a school in which the child

will receive the proper moral and religious training. Just as they always have the right, so they always have the duty of helping the child to develop physically, intellectually, socially and religiously. Parents, therefore, prepare worthy citizens not only for this world, but also for heaven.

ARTICLE IV. The family has the duty of working for the establishment of just laws in the State, and the duty of exercising the right to vote, especially to safeguard moral principles.

I saw a beautiful tapestry in San Francisco this summer. In my curiosity to see everything, I peeked behind it. Some might have wondered what I was looking for. My purpose was to prove to my companion that tapestries are beautiful from the back as well as from the front. And here was the evidence. On the front, a peacock arched its feathered tail of marine blue with inset eyes of gold; on the back, the feathers were golden, the eyes marine blue. The design was the same, only the colors were reversed. Each side gave emphasis to different features of the one pattern by the change in color.

We view the family as a tapestry. On one side we see its rights, on the other, its duties. The design is the same because God, the Designer, is the same. The accent of color is reversed, but the picture is not distorted; it remains a work of divine art. Only now from the viewpoint of

duties we see the family's civic character brought to the fore with newness of color. By fidelity to these duties alone can the family achieve through the State its temporal perfection and guarantee the integrity of civil society.

ARTICLE V. The family should foster individual and social virtues and maintain the order of dignity impressed on the family by God: the husband is the head, the wife is subject to the husband, the children must obey and respect their parents.

There may be moderns who do not see any educational or religious value in having Jane wash the dishes at night or in sending Johnny down to the store. The immediate value of encouraging Bill to be an altar boy and to serve the early Masses on cold, drab mornings, may not be too evident. The helping of Virginia Marie with the little altar in the corner of her bedroom may seem very trivial, and the giving of a good spiritual book to Mike for picking up papers in the basement may be thought harmful to the "self-expression of youth." And yet these and similar acts, glamourless though they may be, are the magic that transforms the house into a home, that builds up filial affection and eternal bonds of loyalty. These are the acts of true drama that Hollywood would like to imitate but cannot. For they do not depend on paint and costumes, on lighting or setting;

they depend on real love in a family.

Yes, some moderns may raise their eyebrows at these actions and condemn them as naive. They may prefer to train their children by substituting vitamins for virtues. But these same people will need more than pills to assuage their broken hearts when their children show in their actions that they do not know God or care for His Fourth Commandment. As the tree is bent, so it will grow.

ARTICLE VI. The Model for all families is the Holy Family of Nazareth.

In a little white-washed town, Nazareth, there lived over nineteen-hundred years ago, a perfect family. We have all come to know the quiet man, the loving mother, the inspiring Boy. Everyone refers to them in a simple way—*Holy*. This is the Holy Family—no doubt as to its identity—the earthly trinity of Jesus, Mary and Joseph.

In the quiet, hard-working and devoted Joseph all fathers will find an exemplar of the virtues needed in the head of the home. Joseph knew worry, exhausting labor, hardship. He found strength in humble reliance on divine providence and in prayer. He saw God in the Child, God's beloved daughter in his wife. In their grateful love he found the dignity of his labor. In Mary all mothers will find the ideal of self-sacrificing love. Home was her first and last thought.

Toil then to make it bright and clean, spend time in preparing appetizing meals. She it was who was ever ready to console and comfort; ever solicitous for the well-being of her Joseph and Jesus. And in Christ every child will find the perfect model of obedience and respect to his parents, for He "was subject to them."

This is the Holy Family, the family that must be held up before the eyes of men today for the regeneration of human society. This is the family that must be given to our world in the faithful reproduction of truly Christian homes. Then and only then may we look forward to true and lasting peace.

School for "Baby-Sitters"

An institution or school intended to train nursery maids would appear an innovation in the year 1947. But an endeavor of this very nature came into existence in the old mining town of Freiberg in Saxony as long ago as 1807. Acting probably under the influence of the philanthropical movement of the age, a wealthy citizen of the ancient commune decided to establish a school to train properly young girls to whom families intended to entrust small children. He may have felt that the average servant of this kind, herself almost yet a child, possibly not brought up too well, was hardly fit for the responsible task assigned to a children's nurse by parents. Unfortunately, the available sources on the subject are most meager. But we do know that this school continued to exist far into the 19th century. A city-guide, published in 1876, refers to the building which housed the institution, as "one of the more recent ones."

Now that parents with small children, who may wish to pass an evening away from home, so frequently discover it to be a difficult problem to provide for the care and safety of the little ones in their absence, those nursery maids for a night known as "baby-sitters" play a needed role. But is the generally haphazard selection of such a temporary nurse compatible with the standards we wish to see applied when the life, the welfare, and the health of infants and small children are in question? That a more or less qualified person, of whom the parents may know almost nothing, should be considered a fit and competent guardian for the tots, can be explained only by the helplessness of the parents. A training school for "baby-sitters" appears not at all out of place, considering the circumstances.—*Press Bulletin of the Bureau of The Central Verein, March 6, 1947.*

Caribbean Social Ferment

JOHN P. SULLIVAN, S.J.

*Reprinted from JESUIT MISSIONS**

DURING the month of September 1946 it was my privilege to visit what I might call the Catholic Caribbean. By plane I visited Trinidad, Grenada, St. Lucia, the Barbados, Venezuela, the Dominican Republic, Cuba and the Dutch Isle of Curacao lying off the Venezuelan coast. I had one thing in mind in making this Caribbean journey, to study the Catholic Church's social program on the Spanish Main.

For the most part there was a certain homogeneity in all these countries visited. In general it is all Catholic territory where Catholics are either in a majority or at least have more than a chapel in the hills visited by the missionary once an age. They are almost all bothered by the same social problem, maladjustment of wealth and too much — far too much absenteeism of landowners. But I did learn one thing: the Church's Co-operative and Credit Union Program which we are endeavoring to introduce in every parish in Jamaica, B.W.I. has received a warm welcome and is really getting places in the whole Caribbean country.

Our first bouquet goes to the Irish

Dominican Fathers on the Isle of Trinidad. On this little island twenty miles off the Venezuelan coast the cooperative program is definitely out of the blue-print stage. The parish priests here, especially the Dominican Fathers, are right down on the ground working out the whole program with their people. It can be said to the credit of the Trinidadians that their island is the first to have enacted an adequate Credit Unions Societies Act. Credit Union priority is emphasized and there is a Credit Union League. Although its rural life program is just beginning to break, Trinidad can boast of a small but intelligent group of voluntary Catholic workers. We must not pass by in silence St. Mary's College with its 1,300 boys under the direction of the Holy Ghost Fathers, the Benedictine Monastery on the mountain top, the Catholic Evidence Guild and the vigorous Legion of Mary. All these establishments promise a golden future for Trinidad.

The social program in Grenada can be summed up in one word "Bowring." Grenada, as you know, is a small island of the Wind-

ward group 61 per cent of whose population is Catholic. Father Aldhelm Bowring, the English Dominican, is the backbone of the rural life program here. Under his direction the Grenada Association of Peasant and Industrial Clubs is really making headway. In a day when some influential people are recommending governmental leasehold ownership of the land, it is stimulating to realize that of the 72,374 people on the island there are 15,000 small land owners in Grenada.

THE ISLAND OF ST. LUCIA

What the Irish and English Dominicans have done on Trinidad and Grenada the French Fathers, *Fils Marie Immaculée*, are doing on St. Lucia. This is an island 233 square miles in size, populated to the extent of 69,091, of whom 90 per cent are Catholic. The St. Theresa Credit Union, owing its existence to the genius of Father Gabriel Brivet F.M.I., is the only credit union on the island. Cooperatives might have begun sprouting here earlier were it not for the fact that the French Catholic missionaries, who have been doing undramatic yet heroic missionizing here, are understaffed and over-worked. One priest has been here since 1885, another since 1893. Iron men I call them!

A little bit of Holland in the tropical Caribbean is Curacao, smaller in size than St. Lucia but

larger in population. Here there is no unemployment problem. In fact about 9,000 Portuguese, Venezuelan, St. Lucian, Trinidadians and Barbadian workers are imported every year for its major industry—oil. Although there is no compulsory education law in Curacao, illiteracy is only 3 per cent. Its ample school facilities for all can be attributed to the Dutch government which builds, equips and repairs schools, pays the teachers' salaries and leaves the entire management and control of schools in the hands of the Catholic Church, for Catholics form 80 per cent of the entire population. Recently the Church here built 122 new homes for the poorer people. These homes are all cement or stone structures since wooden ones are legally forbidden. I have called this "Holland in the Caribbean" advisedly, for as in Holland there is a Catholic trade union and a Catholic political party, so here there is the same. Working with Dutch doggedness the Vicariate produces a Catholic daily in the Papiamento Patois from its own printing press, two Catholic weeklies and all kinds of literature. Here, too, is an Allied Seamen's Home with a full time port Chaplain, Father J. B. Van der Meer, O.P., affording sailors an opportunity to receive the sacraments while in a port famous for its luxurious hospitality. Curacao has its Boys' Town in the country. It is run by husky Hollanders, Brothers

known as the Crusaders of St. John. The most striking feature to the casual visitor are the smooth asphalt roads leading to all points and the absence of mosquitoes and termites, the bane of the tropics, which makes it possible to sleep without a mosquito net. Needless to say the prime movers behind this whole project have been and still are the Dutch Dominican missionaries!

We shall bypass British Honduras, where Father Marion Ganey, S.J. and his fellow Jesuits under Very Reverend Father Hickey, S.J. are showing what Co-ops can do, for you have carried their stories before, and we'll get off to Ciudad Trujillo in the Dominican Republic up in the Greater Antilles. The Dominican Republic with its population approaching 2,000,000 is practically all Catholic. His Excellency, Msgr. Ricardo Pittini, the amazingly able Archbishop of Santo Domingo, makes it clear that the cooperative aposto-

late is needed among the proletarians. The start is to be made by the Scarborough Foreign Missionaries under Father Alphonsus Chafe S.F.M.

Let me recap the over-all picture. Looking only at the self-help program I discover the co-ops on the march all over the Spanish Main. Perhaps the most pronounced advance is being made on the British Islands. The hierarchy is definitely interested. His Grace, Msgr. Finbar Ryan, O.P., the Archbishop of Port of Spain, His Lordship, Bishop Thomas A. Emmett, S.J. of Jamaica, and His Excellency, Msgr. Ricardo Pittini, Archbishop of Santo Domingo, are behind the movement. But the down-to-earth participation in the social apostolate, and in co-ops especially, manifested by the priest missionaries, with voluntary lay leaders working in an altruistic manner, makes me say: "Caribbean countries, arise!"



Prerogatives of Mary

The prerogatives which the Church recognizes in the Virgin Mother of God flow naturally and logically from the sublime mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God, Who became bone of her bone and flesh of her flesh by the power of the Holy Spirit in her immaculate body. The glories of Mary are for the sake of her Son. They are essential to the Catholic Faith and integral to the worship of Christ, true God and true man.—*James Cardinal McGuigan, D.D., Archbishop of Toronto.*

Why Priests Should Concern Themselves with Social Questions

MOST REV. MICHAEL J. BROWNE, D.D., D.C.L.
Lord Bishop of Galway

*Reprinted from CHRISTUS REX**

THE answer to this question is contained to my mind in three propositions. The Catholic Church has a clear, authentic and valid teaching on these questions. This teaching is vitally necessary for the spiritual and temporal welfare of mankind. Every priest on the pastoral mission can do something to get it known and applied.

I shall submit some thoughts on the first and third of these propositions.

I

AN OBJECTION

For the last fifty years Catholic laymen and priests have been drawn to the study of the Church's doctrine on social and economic questions. Strikes, unemployment, housing, credit reform, socialization, state-control—all the ills of a suffering world tug at their hearts and consciences and send them searching for the truth. As long as their interest in the subject remains purely academic and theoretical, they will not run into trouble. But as soon as they try

to spread their knowledge and to get it acted on they will meet with objections and opposition, naturally.

There is one objection which many find to be very disconcerting. It is that priests have really no business to be dealing with these things at all. Their kingdom is not of this world. Our Lord refused to interfere in temporal disputes (Luke 12:15). The proper sphere of the Church is in religious and spiritual matters—the relations of the soul with God. Priests do not have knowledge of industrial and economic affairs and their interference in them is impertinent and unhelpful. When a clever economist or bank director lets himself go on this theme, he can be very effective, and pious as well. He can show a very high respect for the true functions of clergymen and an earnest desire to keep them unspotted from this world.

What kills the poor social enthusiast is that many of his own brethren will agree with the bank director and economist. They shake their heads at all such activities as social study

clubs, weeks, meetings and discussions: they keep within the safe circle of confessional, sacristy and arm-chair; and pride themselves that they are attending to the real work of a priest.

But when we come to examine the objection, we find that it carries us very far. The plea that the proper sphere of the Church is religious and spiritual and does not include temporal or material affairs may sound convincing at a Rotary Club lunch, but to anyone who knows even a little of the history and teaching of the Catholic Church it should make him uneasy. He will want to know exactly what you mean by spiritual and religious. For this argument has been used for a great many other things besides economics. It has been the stand-by of those who said that the Church should not interfere in politics, for instance. And under politics they included marriage and divorce, education, burial and what-not. For the same reason the Church has been warned off international affairs of peace or war—she should not soil her holy hands with them. Whenever a great statesman has come forth with a program of state schools, eugenics, sterilization and nationalization of property for home consumption and total war, subjection of slave-races for foreign consumption, he has always given perfect freedom to the Church, provided she minded her own business as he defined it for her.

And there have always been clerics who submitted and kept to the sacristy and contemplation.

But the Church has not submitted. She has resisted vigorously—in fact violently and always. She has interfered and declares that she intends to interfere in politics and international affairs whenever and wherever they infringe on her sphere; and she claims that she has the right to determine what is religious and spiritual. Her history is a complete repudiation of the right of politicians to tell her what is her proper business.

UNsound in Principle

The objection, therefore, is to her unsound in principle. And its roots are bad. They go back to Occam and Marsiglio of Padua who held that the Church was subject to the Emperor; to Luther who made the Church subject to the Prince and to all these anti-religious or anti-clerical liberals who held that the Church was a voluntary religious association concerned only with questions of ritual or creed. Those who deny the divinity of Christ and the divine origin of the Church naturally repudiate her interference. But the Lutheran denial of external objective authority to teach morals as well as faith, the idea that religion is a matter of private judgment and that my idea of what Christ thinks about birth-control is as good as yours—that has seeped into the Catholic fold and led to the

liberal anti-clerical attitude and has infected even clerics themselves.

Private judgment in religious and moral questions is the antithesis of the idea of authority and guidance, of the doctrine that Christ established an authority to teach morals as well as faith, to give moral guidance on all questions. This means an authority to say when a question is moral, when it involves sin and endangers a man's salvation.

I am not concerned to state whether those who say the Church should not interfere in politics or economics are heretics. But of this I am certain: they have been condemned and refuted by the Popes. To confine ourselves to social and economic affairs Leo XIII asserted most clearly the right and duty of the Church to lay down the moral law about them. Pius XI and the present Holy Father have maintained and confirmed the same teaching in many encyclicals and addresses. And they have continued to define and assert the Catholic teaching and to call for its adoption though they were quite conscious that some even of the Catholic body took offense at their efforts.

II

WHY THE CHURCH INTERVENES

It is of interest to examine the reasons why the Catholic Church and its priests have a duty and a right to concern themselves with the social question.

In the first place they are bound by charity to defend and relieve the poor and the working-class who are the victims of unemployment, low wages, bad housing, high prices and all the other evils of the modern world. Charity is the fundamental Christian virtue: it is going to figure prominently at the last judgment. It means that each single priest and layman is bound to do what he can to remedy the defects of the social system. Certainly the least he may be expected to do is to get to know the remedy and help apply it.

The second reason is because the Church is bound to save souls. Her critics are always telling her that this is her job and she should keep to it. Quite, but the most potent influence at present for the perversion and destruction of souls is economic and social disorder. Pius XI in *Quadragesimo Anno* has described how social and economic conditions not merely prevent men from attending to eternal salvation: they have corrupted and degraded them. The economic system is an educative, formative force in moulding a people's character; it can produce men who are solely concerned with wealth, unscrupulous, hard and selfish, as can be readily seen today.

The third and most important reason is that the Church was given the right and the duty to teach the doctrine of Christ. She was made custodian and teacher of the truth. She

on
pre
les
len
fut
Pi
de
it
ca
w

has the truth and must preach it, proclaim it and apply it to the modern world and its condition.

This is her glory and privilege. When one reads the writings of non-Catholics on the social question, one realizes the divine strength of the Church. They admit that the economic system has drifted from Christian moorings and that there is need of moral guidance; but when it comes to clear and definite moral teaching they fail. For they have no teaching authority and they have no hope of agreement on any program or policy as Christian. When their religious leaders could not agree on the morality of birth control, there is little likelihood that they will agree on the wide and difficult field of social and economic questions. They are lost in a welter of conflicting human opinions, but the Catholic Church teaches as one having power. We cannot be sufficiently grateful for the clear guidance which the Popes have given Catholics in the last few years. It is only when we contrast it with the doubts, hesitations and helplessness of non-Catholic bodies that we can realize its value.

Of course there are some earnest and scrupulous souls who are never satisfied in the matter of moral guidance. They would like the Pope to tell them how many shillings a week they should pay each employee, just as they want to know how many ounces to eat on a fast day. The func-

tion of a teaching authority is to affirm general moral truths, rather than deal with individual cases. The Church has decided clearly and definitely on the legitimacy of property, on the just wage, on Socialism, on vocational groups, on the true functions of the State. She does not propose to give exact plans and specifications for the reform of the particular abuses and defects of each of the sixty more or less civilized states of the earth. She does not propose to give a blueprint of the exact constitution of the perfect Christian society. She tells men what kind of activity is right or wrong. She teaches the nature, rights and destiny of human beings; for she knows exactly what man is: the Creator has revealed it. She teaches that it is God who instituted marriage, education, social life, production and exchange, and she knows what are the purposes which God set out for these. To apply all this moral teaching to particular countries, regions, persons, acts, is the work of bishops, statesmen, priests and confessors in their different spheres. The Church has provided them with the general moral principles.

Failure to understand the function of the Church as the teacher of general moral truths is responsible for another misunderstanding and objection to which laymen and non-Catholics are especially prone. They argue that the Church has neither the equipment nor the mission to pronounce

on technical questions. But she cannot pronounce on economic questions unless she decides on the technical problems which underlie them. *Ergo.*

The major premise can be cheerfully accepted; it is fully admitted by Pius XI.

The minor premise must be simply denied. It looks very reasonable and it seems common sense to say "how can you pronounce on economics without being an economist?"

CHURCH GIVES MORAL GUIDANCE

But the Church has pronounced on medical questions without being either physician or surgeon. She has defined the morality of birth control, abortion, craniotomy, euthanasia and many other such questions. She did not need to know how to practice medicine or surgery. All she needed was to understand what these actions meant and did: then she decided whether they were wrong. Of course a certain amount of enquiry and investigation was necessary, but only such as ordinary intelligence, education and reading can provide.

So, too, about any stock exchange or commercial transaction; all the Church requires to know is what exactly it is and does, and then she will say whether it is stealing or not. Most priests can understand the case of medical ethics, and I think it provides the best explanation of how moral teaching does not depend on purely technical skill or knowledge. There

are doctors who deprecate the interference of the Church in medical matters: it cramps their style. But the Church has gone ahead with her job.

Obviously it is necessary that the Church shall exercise great care in understanding the nature and effects of a medical operation which is put in question, and shall adopt every available means thereto. Hence it is necessary that ethicists who deal with such questions shall understand medical terms and descriptions and consult with the best medical opinion. But the fact remains that they can understand the nature and effects of an operation without being doctors.

So the Church can determine the morality of business or industrial transactions without being either bankers, manufacturers or traders. Sometimes, indeed, it is remarkable how little bankers know of the real nature of their activities: the men who manage branch or central offices very efficiently can be quite hazy on the merits of the gold standard or a managed currency. An intelligent, observant outsider is often able to assess more accurately the real nature and effects of the commercial or industrial transactions involved.

But it is necessary for the development of moral science that the Church be kept informed—either by her own specialists or by Catholic laymen working in these occupations —of the latest practices and proce-

dures in order that she may promptly apply to them the moral law and call things by their right names. Hence the great importance of Catholic universities where there are men who are trained observers and specialists in all the sciences, of reviews and journals which discuss new developments, of contact with unions and associations of professional and business men. Through all such means Catholic social science develops and keeps pace with modern developments. Some historians think that it failed to do this in the 14th-16th centuries, mainly because the universities had lost touch with life. Whatever the cause, the results were sad.

I have tried to establish the proposition that the Church gives clear, authentic moral guidance and that her competence to give it is certain and divine.

The next proposition is that this guidance is most important for the good of souls, the honor and prestige of religion, the prosperity and peace of nations. I shall not labor this proposition.

III

WHAT PRIESTS CAN DO

But there is a third proposition which may need some defense; it is that every priest on the pastoral mission should know the social teaching of the Church thoroughly. It may be asked what need is there for the priest in the small towns or villages or

countryside of Ireland to bother his brains with this subject. What good can he possibly do? The cynical and pessimistic brethren will assure him that he is wasting his time, for he can do nothing to bring about social reforms and may burn his fingers badly: only statesmen and politicians can bring about social reform.

Quite true, only legislators can change the laws. But they generally do so only in response to public opinion. And the education of public opinion on the social teaching of the Church is the right and duty of the priest. It depends on him whether the Catholic people—men and women of every class—will understand the issues and perform their duty at local and general elections and in their political clubs as Catholic citizens, or whether they will be ignorant and indifferent to everything but their own narrow, selfish interests. There are plenty of occasions at sodality meetings and in parish hall gatherings when the people can be told, at least, that the Church has a teaching and where they can read it.

There is a smaller circle of persons who will need more from the priest. Politicians and laws do not make up the whole of the picture. Employers, farmers, trade unions make decisions, take up positions, and it is the aggregate of all these decisions which make up a very important part of national opinion. Trade unions of workers and federations of employers occupy a

central position in the economic life of this country. They are democratically administered according to the votes of members. They will adopt the Catholic point of view if their members vote in accordance with Catholic teaching. But who will teach and guide these ordinary rank and file members if not their priest? There is no question of dictation or of political partisanship. If the moral teaching is given them, they can apply it.

There is still a further and more important circle which will look to the priest for guidance—it is those who exercise or aspire to leadership in trade unions, employer federations or political life. If they are imbued with Catholic teaching, we can have more confidence. For often a Catholic rank and file can be got to follow a glib but clever Socialist or worse. Now the formation of our leaders in the economic field is going to be one thing or another, Catholic or Socialist. There is an abundance of leftist literature, and we shall soon see the revival of leftist workers' colleges. Pius XI, in Q.A., has said: "Undoubtedly the first and immediate apostles of the workingmen must themselves be workingmen, while the apostles of the industrial and commercial world should themselves be employers and merchants. It is your chief duty, Venerable Brethren, and

that of your clergy, to seek diligently, to select prudently, and to train fittingly these lay apostles amongst workingmen and amongst employers." Then he proceeds to describe how this is to be done. Are we forgetting this duty in Ireland?

Now if a young man comes to a priest for guidance on the social question, it will not do to give him a pamphlet containing the text of *Quadragesimo Anno* and send him away. He has probably read it already. The text of papal documents is somewhat technical: it must be taken in its context and with its general theological background. Here is where the priest can provide help, encouragement, direction—especially if he has done some reading himself. He will need patience, prudence and charity, but he needs these in everything.

Young priests may say that they will find little such demands in the country curacies where the young vegetate. But if they do not develop knowledge of this subject when they are young, they will not have the time or interest when they have reached an urban curacy.

In conclusion, I submit that any priest who considers the possible demands on him of these three circles—the general public, the vocational rank and file, the actual or potential leader—cannot say: "Quae utilitas in labore meo?"

THE EDITORIAL MIND

Curbing Commies

MAX H. SORENSEN, national commander of the Catholic War Veterans, urges that all Communists, whether citizens or not, be "deported," and the Communist Party be outlawed.

We cannot go along with Commander Sorenson in any such horrendous program.

American citizens have a legal right to be Communists if they want to, so long as they do not engage in any overt acts of disloyalty. To take any other position is to launch a "thought control" movement which will end in violation of civic liberties.

The cure for Communism does not lie in legal repressions dangerous to the freedom of everybody. Such measures will have no other effect than to drive the Communist Party underground.

Americans should meet the Communist problem in an American fashion, by using two weapons against it:

1. Scientific and methodical exposure of Communist personalities, aims, methods, activities. It is essential that we include in this a ruthless exposure of those who follow the "party line" while denying affiliation

or sympathy with the Communist Party. Give the people the facts and they will throw out the Reds by democratic process.

2. Basic correction of the evils of monopoly capitalism, and extension of our democracy to all areas of life. Distribute the vast resources of this land to all the people, give all races and religions a fair deal, make the citizen feel that the government is his—and we need not fear the Communist conspiracy.—*THE WAGE EARNER, Detroit, Mich., Mar. 28, 1947.*

Isolationism

AS TO the obstinacy which Russia is displaying in its foreign relations, it should serve as a warning to this country against any relapse into the error of isolationism. For Russia is acting precisely as our isolationists wanted this country to act—with utter disregard of anything but her own immediate interests. It is a Russian form of the "America First" policy, and just as short-sighted. For Russia, in grabbing what she wants for her own "security," and letting weaker countries endure all sorts of hardship because she

will not co-operate in adjusting post-war disorder, is building up future ill-will for herself and delaying the revival of world prosperity which is essential to the prosperity of any individual country. Worst of all, she is resisting the establishment of justice and is refusing to recognize the human dignity that belongs to all peoples.

There are still some voices demanding that the United States go back to its isolationism and let the rest of the world "stew in its own juice." Russia presents a practical example of what that policy means when applied in thorough ruthlessness.—*THE PITTSBURGH Catholic, Pittsburgh, Pa., May 23, 1946.*

Man and the Peace

IT is not surprising that the Catholic Bishops' statement, "Man and the Peace," received wide publication in the daily press, for it strikes at the core of the world's troubles.

Bringing out that the problem of man is at the bottom of all the problems besetting the world today, the statement urged a renewed sense of the sacredness of human life.

"It speaks out for ideals which ought to be close to the hearts of all Americans," says *The New York Times*.

William Philip Simms, Scripps-Howard newspapers' authority on international affairs, refers to the state-

ment in an article comparing Russia's desire for a "totalitarian world in which the vast majority jumps to the whip of the few," to the democracies' desire for an atmosphere "wherein the peoples concerned are free to choose for themselves."

We are striving now toward a goal of world opinion which will condemn and put out of effective operation any peace plan the motif of which is other than the recognition of man's inalienable rights as the necessary endowment of his divine origin. The scene has shifted from political to moral issues. Only the light of Christ's justice and humanity can dispel the darkness of man's inhumanity to man, as evidenced by the ruthless herding of uprooted peoples, the pitiful plight of hundreds of thousands of war victims.

Every Catholic citizen should be interested in the final prayer of the Bishops' statement:

"May the Saviour enlighten and strengthen them [peace-makers] to imitate His blessed example and, in sacrifice and unselfishness, in the clear light of reason, secure for all men the enjoyment of their God-given rights, so that they may follow their vocation as sons of God and brothers in Christ."

But it will be difficult to reach a decision, for Soviet Russia stands for state absolutism and this is the basis of the conflict at the peace table.

One certainty is that the masses of the people know that once again the

Catholic Church stands as the champion of the rights of the common man.
—THE CATHOLIC VIRGINIAN, *Richmond, Va.*, Nov. 29, 1946.

Spread Ownership

CONCENTRATION of wealth and of the power over production is, as the Popes have pointed out, the patent mark of our era. This condition has resulted in the formation of propertyless wage-earning classes among whom poverty, unemployment and seething discontent are often rife.

Now obviously if many of the dangers which threaten to engulf our society today stem from this source (the connection with Communism and the dictatorships needs no laboring) the solution must lie in the removal of these economic conditions by the distribution of ownership among the masses. This does not preclude remedial action on the part of the State meanwhile—minimum wage laws, unemployment insurance and such like. Rather it pre-supposes it. But it does mean that such measures of themselves will never get to the root of the difficulty. Their multiplication indefinitely and without good cause only increases the dependence of the masses, and leads inevitably to some form of Socialism.

The direction, then, in which we must work, if we want to combine freedom with security, is the restora-

tion of productive property to people. That, according to the Encyclicals, is the solution in principle. "Own or be owned," might be their slogan. The problem is to employ all available means toward the diffusion of ownership. It is this primal end which gives purpose and cohesion to such diverse measures as labor unions, the co-operatives, differential taxation, the guild order, and so on.—ZEALANDIA, *Auckland, New Zealand*, Jan. 23, 1947.

Negroes in Department Stores

IN RECENT years quiet but increasingly successful efforts have been made to widen opportunities for Negroes in white-collar fields. This is especially true of department store employment. The Negro is no longer merely the porter or elevator operator. He is also the salesman or clerk, whose intelligence, skill and courtesy are making a useful impress on the buying public. The coincidental effect of this on Negro worker morale and better Negro-white understanding does not need to be stressed.

The Catholic Interracial Council has had a share in bringing about higher-level employment of Negroes in leading New York department stores. Efforts along these lines have also borne fruit in other large cities, especially in New Jersey and Massachusetts, according to a manual on

"Integration of Negroes in Department Stores" prepared by the National Urban League.

As late as 1938, the retail merchandising field was described as being "barred to Negroes as effectively as if by legislative fiat." At present, however, according to Leroy Jeffries, assistant director of the Urban League's Industrial Relations Department, fourteen large merchandising firms in the New York area use Negro sales and stock clerks, stenographers and personnel executives. Six clerks are employed in two Newark stores, while Boston stores are using twenty Negro sales girls, in addition to clerical workers.

Department stores in a number of small western and mid-western towns are hiring Negro clerks. In Milwaukee, Wis., the first Negro clerk

was hired early this year. Meanwhile a movement is being pushed in Chicago to secure employment of Negro women as sales clerks in the big "Loop" stores. In a practical plan to strengthen this campaign and to prepare prospective jobholders for better grading in department store work, the Urban League is encouraging training courses in merchandising and retailing, in cooperation with department store management.

All this adds up to one of the most encouraging aspects of postwar Negro employment. That there are other white-collar spheres in which a similar improvement remains tragically overdue, does not detract from the satisfaction of knowing that headway is being made in at least one important field. — *INTERRACIAL REVIEW, New York, N. Y., Nov., 1946.*



Civic Responsibility

Elections need a reformation. We have the power to control our city, our state and our country. We should guard that power and privilege with utmost solicitude. Unless we become civic and governmental minded we are swayed by the masses—by mob psychology. We are influenced with electioneering campaign promises which evaporate the day after election.

Let us analyze our politicians. Politics are good. Some politicians are bad. We must learn politics, good politics, in order to distinguish bad politicians. Those we can refuse our vote.—*THE SOUTHERN CROSS, San Diego, Calif., March 8, 1946.*

The Nature of Liberalism

MOST REV. RICHARD J. CUSHING, D.D.

Address by the Archbishop of Boston to the Catholic Association for International Peace, Boston, April 6, 1947.

I AM happy to welcome to Boston the representatives of the Catholic Association for International Peace. People interested in peace must work under strange difficulties in this bewildered world of ours; considering that fact, the Association has done a wonderful work. The list of its publications, particularly in popular pamphlet form, is one of the most impressive modern catalogues of Catholic moral and social teaching. I do not know any other single Catholic Association which has made available to the general public so much genuine Catholic scholarship on so many important social questions as has the Catholic Association for International Peace. I hope that this aspect of your work will continue to flourish.

The Association has rendered a great service to the Church and to the community by the carefully considered positions it has taken on questions of Peace and War. In our generation few questions are more complicated by the elements of prejudice, emotion and partisanship which impede clear thinking and balanced judgment. Yet the Catholic Association for International Peace has

achieved such thinking on its own part and on the part of others, despite the particularly difficult international questions which have come up during these last two decades, questions of special difficulty for Catholics and for peace-lovers. The Association deserves the grateful commendation of the Teaching Church for the part which it has played in presenting to the public the Church's point of view on the pressing problems of the day.

I speak to you this evening as a priest, an Archbishop of the Catholic Church. I always try to make it a point on occasions like this to speak in no other way. There are so many others who can and should speak as statesmen, as economists and as technical experts of various kinds, that there is normally no need, it seems to me, for the priest to venture into the domain of these.

On the other hand, there is a tremendous need that more and more priests lift up their voices in the field of *Faith and Morals*, to apply the principles of Christian morality to the human problems of politics, economics and the technical aspects of peace. There is more than enough for priests to do in attempting to

teach *morality* to this unmoral age created by secularism, without their undertaking to settle the political problems of the day. I say this, of course, without forgetting that the priest remains a citizen and that as a citizen he has the right and the obligation to take part in the determination of public policies. Neither am I unmindful of the tremendous contribution which the priest can make toward the direction (the spiritual direction, if you will) of those who legitimately seek his enlightened counsel in the solution of the problems of public society. The Catholic priest is always heard with respect, even by the nonsectarian audience, when he speaks as a Spiritual Director on these matters.

CHRISTIAN MORALITY

My only point is this: There is no lack of diplomats in the world. The Lord knows there is no lack of politics. There is no lack of economists in the world. But there is not so great a wealth of moral directives and there are not so many moralists whole-heartedly applying themselves to the task of developing and defending in the public forums of the world the contribution Christian morality must make to the building of the peace.

The moral prerequisites of abiding peace are many. I cannot possibly touch on more than a few, but fortunately the Peace Association it-

self provides an abundant literature with regard to the others. Most of this literature is by way of commentary on and popularizing of the peace pronouncements of our Holy Fathers, the Popes. I do not know what the eventual judgment of history will be on the conduct of the Church during the bewildering crisis of our age. Perhaps because of our limited perspective, living as we do in the very midst of the times and so close to the Church, we are prone to be more enthusiastic than others about the work which the Chief Shepherds of Christendom have done for peace. On the other hand, please God, future critics will correct the unjust charges and will temper the bitterness of those hostile to the Holy See and to the Catholic Hierarchy whom present day partisanship and prejudice have blinded.

I am convinced, however, that in our day the Church has been more blessed than at any like period in history with Popes who have been *peace-makers* and who have used their exalted position as a pulpit rather than a throne, as a means of Christ-like moral teaching and of only such diplomatic and other action as has been strictly needed in order to do the moral work which Christ Himself assigned to them. *The peace of Christ in the reign of Christ*—this has been the objective of all our modern Popes and the only means that they have employed toward the at-

tainment of this objective have been the arms of the spirit, the principles of morality, the moral teachings of Jesus Christ.

In the promulgation of this teaching the Popes have made many enemies. The good Christian never seeks enemies and never deliberately engenders opposition. But sometimes, I think we can say this without being misunderstood, the Christian is dignified by the enemies which his righteous actions make for him. There is such a thing as having the wrong type of friends; there is also such a thing as having the right kind of enemies.

I think the historians of the future will agree that our modern Popes had the right kind of enemies. They provoked the opposition of the Materialist, the Marxist, the Anarchist, the Atheist. They provoked the opposition of the Ultra-nationalist, the Militarist, the Totalitarian and the Racist. All this was inevitable and understandable; there could never be tolerance of the universal Shepherds of Christ's spiritual kingdom by the chieftains of systems mobilized in the name of Nationalism against universal values and in the name of Materialism against everything that partakes of the spiritual. Christianity would be itself false if Communism and Totalitarianism found it acceptable, and the Popes would have been traitors to their very office if the Communists and the Totalitarians had failed to find fault with them.

What is surprising, however, is the enmity to the Holy See on the part of so many who call themselves "Liberals" and who boast of their "Liberalism." And what is most surprising is the lack of sympathy with the Popes in their peace work of those "Liberals" who especially identify themselves with peace planning and with peace work. I want particularly to comment on this point this evening because so many, even Catholics, who are interested in internationalism and in Peace Movements are thought of as being "liberals" in a sense which is unjust to them.

I am anxious to discuss this point also because the thing which too many people are calling "Liberalism" is, as a matter of fact, an obstacle to the building of a moral peace. At the same time, the instinct which leads many people into movements falsely called "Liberal" is a healthy instinct, the expression of a decent Christian virtue sadly lacking among many so-called "Liberals" and particularly needed as a prerequisite for abiding peace. What that Christian virtue is, that virtue of which secular Liberalism is a counterfeit and of which the peace movement stands in great need, it will be my principal business to declare this evening.

Most of what passes for "Liberalism" in our day, certainly all that is best in the points of view called "Liberal," is a pale reflection of the

ancient Christian virtue called *magnanimity*. More than all other moral attributes, more than all other virtues, those who aspire to promote the peace and to reconcile our bitterly antagonistic nations need, not "Liberalism," but *magnanimity*. The word *liberal* is rapidly becoming a discredited word, because the thing to which it corresponds has proved so often unworthy of a name originally so noble. The word *magnanimous* is a word which deserves more frequent use on our lips and more exalted place among our concepts because the thing to which it corresponds, *Christian magnanimity*, is the most constructive and the most peace-building concept men could possibly bring to social thinking and to peace-planning.

REASON FOR CRITICISM

Why do we appear so critical of what men call "Liberalism" and why do we find it wise at a convention such as this to lift our voices in warning against any false identification of *Catholic magnanimity* with *secular Liberalism*? A bit of history is probably in order at this point. The word *liberal* has an honorable origin. It is derived from the Latin word *liber* which means *free*, and until a century or so ago it meant only "worthy of a free man," a proud concept indeed. Thus people spoke, as they still do, of the "liberal arts" and of "liberal occupations." Or they spoke of certain "liberal" qualities of

intellect and will which characterize people or urbanity and culture. So the word "Liberalism" was originally and naturally associated with a certain intellectual independence and cultural geniality. It came to be applied, logically enough, to political opinions which were opposed to Absolutism or to that centralization of political and economic power which would be inconsistent with the dignity of free men. In all these senses, far from being opposed to Catholic thought, the original "liberal" attitude was undoubtedly inspired by principles and values transmitted from the Catholic Middle Ages and through the Christian Renaissance.

It happened that toward the end of the 18th Century political factions appropriated to themselves the word "Liberal" and made "Liberalism" a school of thought calling for a partial or total emancipation of man from all supernatural and religious principles in his intellectual, political and economic life. The so-called "Principles of 1789" in the French Revolution are usually thought of as the Magna Carta of this systematic "Liberalism." Such "Liberalism" secularized morality, social philosophy, political thought and eventually even religious thought. It excluded all reference to divine authority and it relegated all religious and moral considerations from public life into the private domain of individual conscience. It ignored on principle or-

ganized Christianity and resisted the Church as a divinely instituted religious teacher. Before there was any question of the condemnation of "Liberalism" by the Church, the secular liberals themselves excluded the Church and all that the Church stands for from their thought and policy by both positive action and by negative neglect.

As secular "Liberalism" developed and gained adherents it distorted even further the original meaning of the word "liberal." Becoming more and more political and naturalistic, secular "Liberalism" became anti-ecclesiastical, anti-clerical and anti-authoritarian. This "anti" aspect of "Liberalism" unfortunately gained the upper hand over any positive and constructive elements in the liberal tradition, and so in France, Italy, Germany, Spain and elsewhere the ranks of the "Liberals" became swollen with renegade Catholics and militantly anti-religious free thinkers among others. Legislation hostile to the Church and teaching militantly directed against her creed and her morality became the principal activity of the typical schools of European Liberalism.

It is only against the background of the unworthy and repressive laws against the Church in Europe fostered by the so-called "Liberals" that one can understand the repeated condemnation of "Liberalism" by the Holy See. Not merely theologically,

but logically there was nothing the Church could do in the face of the organized aggression of "liberals" against her rights but condemn "Liberalism" in the form which it had taken by the middle of the 19th Century.

It would be a long and a bitter story to describe the war waged against Catholicism by political and philosophical "Liberalism" in 19th Century Europe. I shall not attempt to tell that story. Suffice it to say that the war, both in its motives and its methods, completely discredited the once noble name of "liberal." Ever since, conscientious Catholics both in Europe and in America have bristled at the word and have gravely suspected the intentions of those who call themselves by a name which is associated with so much unhappiness in the lives of Christian individuals and nations.

It should be insisted that many of those who nowadays call themselves "Liberals" here in America sincerely wish to profess their adherence to the ancient values behind the old word "liberal," rather than their approval of the crimes committed by the political factions who appropriated that glorious name and brought it into dishonor. The cause of understanding and tolerance, the building of a peaceful world, would be better served by us and by our non-Catholic neighbors who sincerely wish to work with us in providing the moral pre-

requisites of abiding peace, if we would stop using the discredited word "liberal" and would begin practicing the neglected Christian virtue *magnanimity*.

More than all other virtues, I repeat, magnanimity is the virtue needed to create a moral atmosphere in which decent peace treaties and effective world organizations can be devised. Magnanimity means greatness of soul. It has to do with honor and honorable actions; it makes noble deeds its end. It inspires us to despise the petty whether in personal opinions or public policies or social programs. It impels us to seek less the satisfaction of self and more the decent opinion of mankind. It urges us to deal with enemies and to work with friends in a manner which will be not merely pleasing to men but even great before God.

"Big" MEN NEEDED

The magnanimous man is a man without prejudices and devoted to principle. The magnanimous nation is a nation without political chicanery and dedicated to humane statesmanship. A magnanimous people are firm in their adherence to their own way of life, but they have minds profound enough and hearts generous enough to enable them to understand and to respect whatever of truth and of greatness there may be in the way of life of others. We shall never have peace plans or peace treaties

bold enough and great enough to change the world until we have "big" men to write them—men who are magnanimous, big-souled.

If you wish an example of what we mean by magnanimity as a Christian virtue in peacemaking and in statesmanship as opposed to the "liberal politics" of our modern secularized Europe, I give you the instance of King St. Louis of France, a magnanimous statesman. His historian tells us that once he freely forfeited his claims as against the King of England. He forfeited them gladly, he said, even though he could easily justify them, but all they would give him would be land and revenue and he valued more the love and friendship of his brother in Jesus Christ, the English King. This is *magnanimity*—a greatness of soul such that it leaps over boundaries and despises material possessions in its zeal to make real the Ideal Vision, the vision of a united world in abiding peace and mutual prosperity under the law of God.

We refuse to believe, we cannot believe that Christianity has lost the power to produce Saints. Indeed, we know that it is able to produce them on every level of life, among all classes and kinds of men and women. Our age has produced poets who were Saints, priests who were Saints, professional men who were Saints, women in the world who were Saints. We must beg God to give us

statesmen who are Saints, rulers who, whatever the form of their Government, are governed above all by God. Such statesmen will have the moral virtues which all religious leaders agree are needed before peace can be made or can endure; justice, charity, prudence, fidelity. But above all they will have that virtue which gives vitality and soul to all the other political virtues: the virtue of *magnanimity*.

In a democracy you and I are the rulers. Every man is, more truly than we sometimes think, a king. Our

part in the making of the peace may be small. We ourselves may be relatively insignificant but we must be magnanimous. We must be able not merely to state and to defend our own interests but to take into consideration and provide for the interests of others. We must be "big." If we are, then we shall have the moral fiber most needed in these evil days. We shall have minds big enough to plan peace and hearts big enough to sacrifice for peace. With God's help we, and the world with us, shall have peace itself!



For Human Rights

Is it not true that in all too many instances men generally become interested in the rights of men and rush to their defense only when their own rights are touched or harmed? Let the danger pass by, and they have neither thought nor word for the rights of others when evils fall upon them. It is the story again of the man who fell among the robbers on his way from Jerusalem to Jericho, who was despoiled of everything, and who was wounded to death; only the good Samaritan, one of three passers-by, helped him. One of three; is that still the proportion? Today it would appear to be a smaller minority. What have you done to protest against the diabolical measure of compulsory deportation from ancient homesteads under conditions of misery and suffering that are without example in history? What do you do now in defense of human rights where your own rights are not concerned?—*Most Rev. Aloisius J. Muench, D.D., Bishop of Fargo.*

Secularist Society and Divorce

*Reprinted from THE ADVOCATE**

THE historians of the future, commenting on the decadence of our twentieth century civilization, will undoubtedly attribute its diseases to the violation of a fundamental "law of life." Human societies in the past have differed widely in their beliefs concerning the gods, and in the details of the ethical rules of conduct related to those beliefs: but about one thing they have agreed—that the common life of men is governed by "sanctities" which must be held inviolable—a code of law which is not the work of merely human power or will, but which is based on some super-human sanction in the "nature of things" to which humanity is subject. The sense of a Divine Personal Will imposing this law may be vivid, as with the Jews, or vague, as with the Confucian Chinese: but about the Law, and its binding force, there is no doubt.

On the contrary, modern secular societies have come to be more and more based on the principle that we have no certain knowledge of any power or law superior to that of man himself, as "the master of things." The State, therefore, while leaving "private opinion" free, assumes, for purposes of public policy, that nothing is to be considered but

the human will-to-power or will-to-comfort in the designing of the social institutions. There is no pre-existing "pattern" as regards family life, or personal rights, which it must observe in its legislation. It may, if it will, fashion the structure deliberately so as to re-mould human nature according to an arbitrary plan of "Socialization" or "Communication," and root out violently the elements that impede the process.

The result of this contempt for the sanctities constitutes a striking proof of the reality of the "higher law" which has been denied: and in nothing is this more apparent than in the evolution of modern marriage in the most advanced countries of the world. The revolt against the Christian Marriage Code, which accompanied the liberal-secularist revolution of thought in the last century, has now run its full course in the United States. The movement began with a plausible appeal that a means of escape should be provided by the law for those who found the marriage-bond intolerable: but once divorce had been permitted as an "ultimate medicine," it was not long before the laws of one State after another were relaxed to meet new demands—until at the end, it has

* 143-151 a Beckett St., Melbourne C. 1, Australia, Feb. 12, 1947

become a "daily food," the normal, easily-sought remedy for those who find their partners in wedlock slightly wearisome, or who are moved by a rival attraction. This process of dissolution was prophesied long ago by Pope Leo XIII, who warned his generation that "*once divorce has been allowed there will be no sufficient means of keeping it in check within any definite bounds.*" Pointing out the weakness of human nature, he foretold that the setting loose of the passions would "spread daily and attack the souls of many, like a contagious disease or a river bursting its banks"; and at the end of this road he perceived the "absolute ruin" of family life and of the State itself.

A DEADLY MENACE

The reality and deadliness of the divorce menace has now forced itself upon the notice of the whole American people—it is no longer possible to ignore the frightful ravages which it is making on the national life. The instability of lawful sexual relationships is demoralizing to men and women. It means a shrinkage of fertility, due to lack of a sense of the true purpose of marriage, or of confidence in the future; and, where there are children, easy divorce spells misery and delinquency due to broken homes—a tragic situation reflected in the appalling statistics of criminal youth. Contempt not only for chas-

ting, but for legality and common honesty is encouraged by the "divorce racket" which is worked by systematic perjury and connivance in perjury. At least one important American center—Reno, in Nevada—owes its prosperity almost entirely to the business of breaking marriages on easy terms, built up by enormous advertisement. Finally, in Hollywood, we see the new legalized promiscuity being practiced by the most envied and popular figures of our time, while the details of their grotesque amours and "marriages" are retailed in publicity journals throughout the globe.

One in three marriages in the United States now ends in the divorce court: and, if the present trend continues, the figure will be one in two in twenty years' time. What future can there be for a country where half the homes are broken, and where the family cell is in complete disintegration? History furnishes examples of the kind on a restricted scale—notably among the luxurious, immoralist aristocracies of the ancient Greek and Roman world. The conclusion has inevitably been the same—the extinction of the breed. Nor should we flatter ourselves that Australia is secure against the demoralization which is far advanced in America. The divorce-rate in our own country is rising to disquieting heights—as it is in Great Britain: and the champions of "freedom" are

still urgent in demanding that the facilities for dissolving marriage should be increased, using all the familiar fallacious appeals to humanity on behalf of "hard cases." True, the "writing on the wall" has now become apparent, and the folly of allowing matters to drift is being urged by a few men of true enlightenment. New measures are proposed for impressing upon those marrying a sense of the solemnity of the act, and of the social obligations which it implies: and a systematic effort is being made to deal with the ills of marriage by organizing reconciliation rather than facilitating its dissolution. All this is excellent, as far as it goes—but it does not go to the root of the evil, which is the irreligion of our times.

The divorce-disease, like the contraception-disease, the worship of the

hideous in art, and the plague of chronic social war, are symptoms which point to the central malady of our secularist civilization—its flight from the reality of the "Tao," the pattern of Divine Order. We shall begin to recover only when our leaders and guides face this truth, and adopt the remedies to which their knowledge points. Then we shall have a design for education, law and liberty, marriage and family life, founded on the true nature of man: and the policy of statesmen will aim at making the plain man vividly aware of the truths that belong to his peace—instead of hiding them from his eyes, and flattering him with foolish dreams. Thus, and only thus, will our modern communities find the way back to sanity, along the uphill road which leads from death to new life.

Racism

From a social and cultural point of view racism to an unimaginable degree degrades and humiliates reason, thought, science and art, which are henceforth made subservient to flesh and blood and are stripped of their natural "catholicity." Among all the types of barbarism which threaten mankind today it inflicts on men the most intrinsically inhuman and hopeless barbarism, since it welds them to biological categories and fatalities from which no exercise whatsoever of their liberty permits them to escape.—*Jacques Maritain in THE INTERRACIAL REVIEW, New York, N. Y.*

An Appeal for Jews

DAVID GOLDSTEIN, L.L.D.

*Reprinted from THE CATHOLIC MIRROR**

CATHOLICS are eternally indebted to the Jews for their greatest personages and glorious principles, as we shall see; hence much is due their descendants in return. This indebtedness Catholics in the United States are most obligated to pay by active work for the conversion of the Jews, as over 5,000,000 of the estimated 10,300,000 Jews in the world today live within our borders.

The Jews have passed through the most trying times they have encountered since the days when, after rejecting the true Messiah (Christ), they rallied to the battle cry of Bar Kochba, the pretended Messiah, who led them to a slaughter that ended in the razing of Jerusalem and their dispersion throughout the world.

The sympathy expressed for the Jews who have suffered the persecution of nazism, and the practical aid given them by our Holy Father Pope Pius XII, and his predecessor of blessed memory, Pope Pius XI, as well as bishops, priests and the Catholic laity, won the praises of leading Jews the world over. This expression of regard for the welfare of the Jews did not becloud the historic fact that the tyrants who

scourged them, from the days of Haman until the days of Hitler, were the servants of divine justice trying to chasten them for sin, the soil in which their affliction was predicted to take root, as forewarned in Jewish Holy Writ (*Leviticus* 26). This principle, of affliction due to sin, applies to the world as a whole, as well as the Jews, it being the basic cause of World Wars. But the principle applied to Jews, collectively, in a peculiar manner, because much had been given to them directly by God that was not given to other peoples, therefore much has been, and still is, expected of them.

The Jews were God's chosen children, with whom God made a special covenant. They were the God-selected keepers and interpreters of God's Law. Their priesthood was of God, whose divinely ordered sacrifices, recorded in the Books of Moses, were offered to the One True God in the Temple in Jerusalem.

Over and above all this was the promise that God the Mighty would come to earth in the Person of His Only Begotten Son (*Ps.2:7*), as He did, through a Jewish Virgin of the house of the great Jewish King

David, to lead them to peace of mind and heart.

Judaism now has no longer a priesthood, sacrifices, altar, Temple, or Sanhedrin (the court that administered justice according to the Mosaic Law), hence the Judaism of today is no longer Old Testament Judaism.

The end of these things, basic to Judaism as the religion of God, took place in the first century of the Christian era, when the Messiah came for whom the holy in Israel of old prayed. He established a Church to take the place of the Temple, with a more perfect priesthood and a perfect Sacrifice, as was promised by the God of Israel.

EXTREME NATIONALISM

This gift of God most of the Jews of the first century rejected, as do their descendants today. They looked for peace through the coming of a political, instead of a spiritual Messiah, the Prince of Peace, with the result that they received neither. So it is with present-day Jews. They seek freedom from affliction through an extreme nationalism, the transformation of an Arab land into a Zionist State, instead of by way of the baptismal font, with the apparent likelihood of grave disappointment.

Sin being the basic cause of the afflictions Jews suffer, in their collectivity, the cure is religious, not secular; moral, not political. First and

foremost is the sin of sins, their refusal to hear the prophet Moses who said: "The Lord thy God will raise up . . . of thy nation . . . (whom) thou shalt hear" (*Deut. 18:15*), who is Jesus, the Prophet of prophets (*St. John 1:45*; *Acts 3:22*).

The Jews are an intellectual people, who rank high in many professions, yet in religion they are confusion-confounded. This is evidenced in the fact that there is no agreement among them as to what constitutes a person a Jew. Hence they designate Einstein a "Jew of Jews" despite his public advocacy of disbelief in a personal God, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, who denies belief in a personal Messiah, in miracles, in revelation and the Bible in the Mosaic sense, led the Jews of America, if not of the world, for many years in the demand that Palestine be transformed into a Jewish State.

Rabbi Joseph Zeitlin of New York City informed us lately, in the *Disciples of the Wise*, after a survey of the United States, that 74 per cent of the rabbis take a naturalistic, instead of a supernaturalistic, view of things religious. This wholesale departure from Judaism caused Rabbi Louis Finkelstein president of the Jewish Theological Seminary (New York), to declare:

What Hitler could not accomplish is being achieved here, day by day, as Jews

are losing their Judaism at such a rapid rate that in a generation or two the American Jewish community will have lost so much that Judaism will cease to have any significance. In my opinion the danger that threatens the Jews of America is as serious in its implications as that which threatened the Jews of Europe when Hitler was in power.

The Judaism of today fails to fill "the vacancy in the lives of the Jews . . . , they no longer believe in the religion of their fathers," says Walter Lippman in *A Preface To Morals*.

That "void" in Jewish hearts the Catholic laity should feel obligated to fill, by bringing their Jewish acquaintances to the realization that Jesus is the Messiah promised to Israel; that His Church is the Jewish theocracy universalized; that in it and through it Judaism, full-blossomed, functions; that it alone offers the peace of mind and heart they yearn for.

The Jews are more approachable today with things Catholic than ever before, thanks to the Christ-like services rendered to their nazi-persecuted brethren by the Pope, priests and Catholic laity of Europe. This has mellowed the hearts of many of them, and thus opened their minds to a consideration of Catholic claims. This accounts for the conversion of the Chief Rabbi of Rome, and thousands of other Jews.

No religion contains a greater intellectual and moral appeal to the Jewish mentality than the Catholic

religion. It is a priestly, sacrificial religion, as was Judaism of old, as a religion of God's making must be. It is the only sound, reasonable, doctrinal religion in the world today; a religion that is as exact, structural and unchangeable in principle as is the multiplication table. Its principles, being divine universal principles, contain within them the solution of the domestic, economic, civic, social and international problems that vex mankind.

Catholics are well aware of the fact that "much has been given" to them through their union with Christ in His Mystical Body. But they do not seem to have an adequate appreciation of their indebtedness to the Jews for this great spiritual joy.

From the Jews came the prophets who foretold the coming of the greatest of the great personages Catholics love to honor, through whom came the principles that are full-blossomed in Catholic belief and practices. From the Jews came Mary, the Virgin Lily of Israel, out of whose womb came the God-Man, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Out of the womb of Israel came the one and the only Church that teaches with Infallible authority; the Church that administers the sacraments that safeguards the spiritual welfare of Catholics in life's journey from the cradle to the grave on to everlasting happiness in the Heavenly Jerusalem.

From the Jews came Peter, the

first Pope; the Apostles, who first propagated the faith that Catholics are privileged to enjoy; the thousands of converts who were the first members of the Church of Christ; St. Stephen, the first Christian martyr; St. Paul, the first great missionary.

From the Jews came the Books in the Old Testament that contain, implicitly or explicitly, all that is basic to Catholic belief, the Books from which the liturgy of the Church was drawn. From the Jews came the Books in the New Testament that tell the story of who Christ is, the truths He taught, the miracles He wrought, the Church He established, the perfection of the Law of the Jews, and the fulfillment of the prophecies.

Surely if we Catholics are to make return to our benefactors in proportion to what has been given us, then should we bestir ourselves by rewarding the Jews of today, the descendants of our benefactors. This we can do through the indulged prayer, such as is requested by the Sisters of Notre Dame de Sion, of Kansas City, Mo., a community that owes its existence to the Fathers Rattisbonne, converts from Judaism:

God of goodness, Father of mercies, we beseech Thee by the Immaculate Heart of Mary, and through the intercession of the Patriarchs and the Holy Apostles, to cast a look of compassion upon the children of Israel, that they may be brought to the knowledge of our only Saviour Jesus Christ and that they may partake of the fruits of the Redemption. Father

forgive them, for they know not what they do.

This Catholics can do through fortifying themselves with the knowledge of the relationship of Old Testament Judaism to New Testament Christianity, in order to bring Jews to the realization of the inheritance that is theirs, an inheritance that awaits them in the Catholic Church that their Messiah established.

Thus will the Jews of today be given an intellectual, esthetic, mystical and sacramental joy beyond synagogic realization. Thus, as Isaiah foretold, will their afflictions be assuaged, their eyes opened, their ears unstopped, and their hands strengthened. For thus "they shall obtain joy and gladness; and sorrow and mourning shall flee away" (*Isa. 51*).

Thus will the Catholic laity help to fulfill the mission of our Lord, that was to the Jews first during His sojourn in the Land of Israel.

Jews are souls for whom our Lord no doubt weeps today as He wept over them in Jerusalem, because they knew not "the time of thy visitation" (*St. Luke 19:44*). Every Catholic ought to feel obligated to wipe away some of these tears, by bringing His wayward people to the realization that all that was great and glorious in the faith of their fathers of old in Israel awaits them today in the Catholic Church.

"My Conscience is Clear: I Am Ready to Die"

ARCHBISHOP ALOYSIUS STEPINAC

TO all charges brought forth against me here, I answer that my conscience in every way is clear (even though the public ridicule this), and I do not seek to defend myself against, nor appeal against the verdict.

For my convictions I am able to bear not only ridicule, hatred and humiliations, but—because my conscience is clear—I am ready at any moment to die.

Hundreds of times here I have been called "the accused Stepinac." There is no one so naive as not to know that with "the accused Stepinac" here on the defendant's bench sits the Archbishop of Zagreb, the Metropolitan of Zagreb, and the head of the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia.

You yourselves have many times appealed to the accused priests here present to acknowledge that only Stepinac is guilty for their's, the people's, and the clergy's stand. The ordinary Stepinac cannot have such influence, only Archbishop Stepinac.

For 17 months there has been waged a campaign against me, publicly and in the press; furthermore, for 12 months I have borne actual

This final address of the heroic Archbishop of Zagreb to the Court which condemned him to sixteen years in prison at hard labor was translated by the Croatian Franciscans of Chicago and distributed by the NCWC NEWS SERVICE.

internment in the Archbishop's palace.

The guilt of the rebaptism of Serbs is ascribed to me. That is incorrect terminology, for he who is once baptized, need not be rebaptized. The question concerns change of religions, and of this I shall not speak in detail, except to state that my conscience is clear and that history shall one day render its judgment in this matter.

It is a fact that I had to remove pastors, for they stood in danger of death from the Orthodox. The Serbs wanted to kill these priests because they refused them entrance into the church. It is a fact that during the war the church had to traverse through difficulties like a snake—and that for the sake of the Serbian people and with the aim of aiding them as far as it was at all possible.

The honorable judge has produced a document showing that I sought an

abandoned Orthodox monastery (once belonging to our own Pauline Fathers) in Orahovica in order to fill it with Trappists whom the Germans had driven away from Reichsburg. I hold that it was my sacred duty to aid my brother Slovenes, whom the Hitlerites had banished, to find temporary shelter.

Because I was the military ordinary, grave criminality is imputed to me. This honorable judge asked me if I did not consider myself a traitor to Yugoslavia because in this matter I sought an understanding with the independent State of Croatia.

I was the military ordinary for the former Yugoslavia. I labored during those eight to nine years to bring this matter to a definite and solid solution. This question was finally solved through the Yugoslav Concordat, which was accomplished after great difficulties, solemnly ratified in the parliament, but then left to dissolve in the streets.

When the war between Yugoslavia and Germany neared its end, I had to extend spiritual aid to the Catholic soldiers of the former Yugoslav Army and of the newly created independent State of Croatia. If, therefore, the state had fallen, but the soldiers still remained, then I had to concern myself with this situation.

I was not *persona grata* to either the Germans or the Ustashi; nor was I an Ustasha, nor did I take their

oath as did your clerks here present. The Croatian Nation unanimously declared itself for the Croatian State and I would have been a blackguard had I not recognized and acknowledged this desire of the Croatian Nation, which in the former Yugoslavia had been enslaved.

DEFENDS CROATIANS

I have said and declared that Croatians were not allowed to advance in the army or to enter the diplomatic corps unless they changed their religion or married a non-believer. That is the factual basis and background of my pastorals and sermons.

Whatever I have said of the right of the Croatian Nation to its freedom and independence is in complete accord with the basic principles enunciated by the Allies at Yalta and in the Atlantic Charter.

If, according to these principles, every nation has the right to independence, then why should it be denied to the Croatian Nation? The Holy See has declared that both small nations and national minorities have a right to freedom. Must, then, a Catholic bishop and metropolitan not be allowed to even whisper of this? If fall we must, then we fall because we have done our duty.

Do not think that the Croatian Nation is pleased with this trial, or that if you give them an opportunity to express themselves I, as a result, shall suffer. I have honored and

respected the will of my people, and I shall continue to do so.

You accuse me as an enemy of the state and the people's authority. I today acknowledge your authority. Who was my authority? I must repeat again: You were my authority from May 8, 1945, and not before that. Where is it possible in the world to obey two authorities; you in the woods, or they in Zagreb?

CANNOT SERVE TWO MASTERS

Should I have submitted to the authority of the illegal Somovic, or—as you say, "exiled"—government in London, or of that in Cairo, or yours in the woods, or theirs in Zagreb? Is it at all possible to serve two masters? That cannot be, according to Catholic morals, the laws of nations and common sense. We could not ignore the authority here, even if it were Ustasha. It was here. You have a right to call me to account only from May 8, 1945.

As to my so-called acts of terrorism, you have no proof, nor will anyone believe you. If Lisak, Lela Sofijanec and others came to me under assumed names, and if I received a letter which I never read, then if it be a crime because men came to me, I shall accept the verdict with equanimity.

It does not trouble my conscience for issuing a certificate of free movement to the Reverend Maric, for I did not do so with the purpose of

creating disorder, and for such guilt I would go to the other world with my soul at peace.

Whether you believe me or not, matters not. The accused Archbishop of Zagreb knows not only how to suffer but also to die for his convictions.

President Bakaric (of Croatia) himself acknowledged to the Reverend Milanovic: "We are convinced that the Archbishop stands behind these acts, but we have no proof." That, for me, is sufficient acknowledgment.

And now, what is the core of the controversy and our vicissitudes, and why has not a peaceful solution been reached? The state prosecutor has many times affirmed that nowhere else is there such freedom of conscience as in this state. I am free to bring out some facts showing the contrary.

Before all, I again affirm: 260 to 270 priests have been killed by the National Liberation Movement. In not one civilized state in the world would so many priests be thus punished for such crimes, as have been imputed to them. Thus, for example, the pastor of Slatina, the Reverend Burger, as a member of the Kultur bund, should have been sentenced, say, to eight years' imprisonment; but no, you killed him because he, in fulfillment of his sacred duty as dean, had saved the sacred vessels of a national shrine.

The Reverend Povoljnpak was, without benefit of trial, murdered like a dog in the streets. And the same has been the fate of accused sisters. In no other civilized state would death have been meted out—only at the very most a prison sentence.

You have made a fatal mistake in murdering priests. The people shall not forgive you for that. Such is your "freedom."

Our Catholic schools, built at the cost of great sacrifices, have been taken away from us. If I had not received seven carloads of foodstuffs from America, we could not have done anything, and that for the children of our poor peasant folk.

With force you took away all the seminary property. You have done nothing less than what the gestapo did in seizing the seminary at Mokrica. We are not against agrarian reforms—the Holy See has issued many encyclicals on social reforms—but they should have been carried out in agreement with the Holy See.

Our orphanages have been useless. Destroyed are our printing establishments, and I do not know if one still exists. We have no more our publications which have so often here been attacked.

Is it not manifestly scandalous to uphold that nowhere does the church enjoy freedom as here?

The Dominicans gave a spiritual book, which was translated by me

from the French, to be printed at a cost of 75,000 dinars. But they never received these books. How much damage was sustained. Is that freedom of the press?

The St. Jerome Society has ceased to exist. It is a grave offense against the people thus to treat their greatest and oldest cultural institution. You have reproached me for the work of my "Caritas." But I say to you here: "Caritas" has performed untold services for our people and your children.

Then there is the question of religious instruction in the schools. You have laid down the rule: in the higher grades of the secondary schools religious instruction is forbidden, and in the lower grades it is according to choice.

How can you give to children the right to determine for themselves when they have not grown up, while those in the higher grades who have the right to vote are not allowed freedom of choice in this regard.

Our nursing Sisters in the Catholic hospitals must bear untold miseries and hardships.

Against the overwhelming opposition of the people you have introduced civil marriages. Why did you not interpret this freedom in accordance with the mentality of our people in America—where rules a wise Republic—where one is free to choose either civil or religious marriage?

We do not deny to you some control over marriage. But it grievously

pains our people when they must first of all enter a civil before a religious marriage. If you had turned to us, we would have given you suggestions on this matter.

Buildings of some of the religious in Backa have been confiscated. Some churches in Split (I do not know whether it is still the case), have been converted into warehouses. Church lands have been seized without any agreement with the Holy See. You have seen that the people, because of your agrarian reforms, refuse to take that land.

No, the material question is the least of our problems. The sad thing is this: not one priest or bishop is today certain of his life day or night. Bishop Srebrnic was attacked in Susak by youngsters at the instigation of influential persons. For three hours they tormented him and even penetrated his room while your police and militia merely looked on.

And I myself experienced the same in Zapresica when I was attacked with rocks and revolvers. Bishop Lach, when he was on a confirmation assignment across the Drave, and even though they knew his purpose, was sent back and held the whole night in the prison at Koprivnica. In fact, your own men who were in the woods came to me and declared: "This is unbecoming conduct. We shall protest to the authorities."

Rocks were hurled through the

windows of the house where Bishop Buric was staying while on a confirmation tour. Bishop Pusic, as I heard, was recently the object of rotten apples, eggs, etc.

Such freedom we hold to be an illusion. And we do not want to exist like outlawed slaves. We shall fight, with all just means, for our rights—and right here in this State.

EXAMPLES OF "FREEDOM"

Here are—so that you may understand why we fight—some three or four more examples of your freedom. In the classrooms it is officially affirmed—in defiance of all historical proofs—that Jesus Christ never existed. Know you then: Jesus Christ is God. For Him we are ready to die. And today, it is your teaching that He never actually lived. If a teacher dared to teach the contrary, it would be certain that he would be cast out.

I tell you, Mr. Prosecutor, that under such conditions the church is not free, but will be annihilated in a short time.

Christ is the foundation of Christianity. You have concern for the orthodox Serbs. I ask you: How can you conceive of orthodoxy without Christ? How can you conceive of the Catholic Church without Christ? That is an utter absurdity.

In the school books it is stated that the mother of God is an adulteress. Don't you know that both for

Catholics and orthodox the mother of God is the holiest of thoughts and affections?

You have ordained, as the official doctrines, that men originated from the apes. Perhaps some may have that ambition. But why order that as an official theory when today no scholar of world renown holds to it?

According to your understanding, materialism is the only worth-while system. And that means erasure of God and Christianity. If there is nothing but matter—then thank you for your freedom.

One of your men of higher influence once boasted: "There is no one in this State whom we could not bring to court and sentence."

To these outrageous charges whereby you place us among murderers and friends of terrorists, I say to you that not all the evil deeds in the former independent State of Croatia were perpetrated by the Demobrani and the Ustashi.

It was not easy for the church, and many difficulties had to be overcome.

Let on one think I want war. Let the present authorities come to an understanding with the Holy See. The church does not recognize dictatorship, but she is not against honest

understandings. If that could be achieved, then the bishops will know what is their duty and there will be no need to seek our priests to point out their (the bishops') guilt, as was done here.

Finally, I want to say a few words to the Communist Party, which, in reality, is my accuser. If you think I have taken the present stand because of material things, you are wrong, for we have remained firm, even after you have made us poor.

We are not against workers realizing greater rights in the factories, for this is in the spirit of papal encyclicals. Nor are we against reforms.

But let the leaders of communism allow us to say: If there shall be freedom to spread materialism, then let us have the right to confess and propagate our principles; Catholics have died and will die for that right.

I conclude: With good will, an understanding can come about. The initiative lies with the present authorities. Neither I nor the Episcopate are the ones to enter this basic agreement. That is a matter between the state and the Holy See.

As to myself and as to the verdict, I seek no mercy. My conscience is clear.

The Interracial Apostolate

MOST REV. AMLETO G. CICOGNANI

Address delivered by the Apostolic Delegate to members of the Catholic Interracial Council of Washington, December 15, 1946.

TO YOU, members of a Group which aims to tighten the bonds of genuine Christian charity between white and colored people, and to vindicate for these latter their God-given rights—to you I am happy to recall on this occasion the words addressed by our Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, in his Encyclical *Sertum Laetitiae*, to the Bishops of the United States:

We confess that we feel a special paternal affection, which is certainly inspired by heaven, for the colored people dwelling among you; for in the field of religion and education we know they need special care and comfort, and are very deserving of it. We, therefore, invoke an abundance of heavenly blessing and we pray fruitful success for those whose generous zeal is devoted to their welfare.

You are working together zealously for the welfare of the colored people, and well deserve to hear the echo of these words of the Holy Father in his very own house, and seat of his Apostolic Delegation.

It has always been the program of the Catholic Church to give back to the human person the dignity conferred on it by God. Likewise it has always been the program of Chris-

tianity to look upon us as brethren, children of one same Father Who is in heaven, and all directed towards the same final destiny.

The fundamental principle of "liberty, equality, and brotherhood" in the mutual relations of men is rooted in man's very nature. It goes back much further than human philosophies or those political movements which made use of it for their own purposes. This principle comes from Christianity. Jesus Christ proclaimed this principle, and it was always preached and insisted on from the time of St. Paul down to our own day. In the sight of God we are all equal.

God has given to man the right of equality. And indeed, every man, without any discrimination whatsoever, is the term of creation, the term of salvation or divine redemption, and the term of the saving apostolate of the Church.

Man is the masterpiece of creation. God created man, and the entire human race comes from the same parents, with equal rights: life, liberty, the right to work, personal responsibilities on the road of life. All of these responsibilities converge

for every one of us towards the gaining of eternal life. Every man has the right and the duty of developing, bettering and perfecting himself. No man can be a blind instrument of another man, or of society. He is not simply an appendage to nature; he is a spiritual being destined for a noble goal. These prerogatives are inviolable. Thus did God create man.

ALL BROTHERS

The human person is the term of Divine Redemption. Every man, from whatever part of the world he comes, and no matter what may be his social position, can repeat with St. Paul: "The Son of God loved me and gave Himself up for me" (*Gal. 2:20*). Christ died for each one of us. For all of us He took upon Himself human flesh, thus ennobling our own flesh by the union of the divine nature with the human nature. Thus the Divine Redemption opened the wellsprings of grace to every member of the human family without distinction: "There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither slave nor freeman; there is neither male nor female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus" (*Gal. 3:28*). Everyone is called to be a child of God and an heir of His Kingdom.

The human person is the term of the saving apostolate of the Church. This apostolate is only the continua-

tion of the mission of Christ: "As the Father has sent me, I also send you" (*John 20:21*), said Jesus to His disciples, and that mission is to make disciples of all nations; to make all of them members of the Mystical Body of Christ; to elevate them to the grace of God; to train them in the teachings of the Divine Master, His Parables, the spirit of the Beatitudes, the doctrine of life, to lead them to charity and brotherhood: *fratres in unum*.

The Church has always fought against those inequalities which keep man from developing his personality according to his nature and his own walk in life. The Church founded religious orders to promote and realize her program; she opened schools and fields of work to all men; from among the lowliest classes she chose even her ministers, by the hundreds and the thousands, and in every period. Just as all men have a right to the sun and to food, in the same way everyone has the right to take his part in the contest of life, to perfect himself, and to eliminate the conditions of inferiority in which he may find himself.

Just a month ago the Bishops of the United States, at their meeting in Washington, published a magnificent statement on the rights of man, entitled "Man and the Peace."¹ The statement opens with these words: "At the bottom of all problems of

¹ Cf. *Catholic Mind*, December, 1946, pp. 9-14.

the world today is the problem of man." The Bishops insist on the necessity and the duty of "protecting man in the enjoyment of his God-given native rights." They remark most appropriately that this is the traditional teaching of Christian civilization. The Declaration of Independence proclaims the same teaching; in reality, it only recalls an old doctrine, a doctrine essentially Christian: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Yes, in the sight of God we are all equal; the basis of this equality is God Himself, whose creatures and children we are, and "with Him there is no preference of persons."

In every word and act of your program I see a manifestation of Christian Love. "Love" is the most beautiful word in the language of Christianity; love is the most powerful force and the fairest field of every apostolate. Your work is carried out

in the field of the charity of Christ. In your discussions and activities, you encounter problems involving no slight difficulties—no matter how clear the principles might be. You face problems of education, employment, labor, housing, marriage, family welfare, social assistance, rights of association and organization. You study and discuss these problems, with a view to securing for everyone the greatest possible share in the common welfare. Always remember that your work is a real apostolate, and that your achievements will be all the greater, if you are strongly inspired by the charity of Christ. As examples and models of this charity you have—to cite only a few—St. Peter Claver, St. Francis Xavier, St. Vincent de Paul. The charity of Christ is patient and kind, not self-seeking (*1 Cor. 13*), and it never fails; its fruits are recorded in the Book of Life, because they aim at the realization of the great commandment of the Gospel: our mutual and common brotherhood, in the love of God and neighbor.



Church and Marriage

The Roman Catholic Church has but one voice the world over. It elevates the marital condition to a sacramental holiness. Those who reproach her for her changeless decree may well scan the heavy returns of sorrow and trouble attendant upon its desecration elsewhere.—**THE MONTREAL DAILY STAR, Jan. 20, 1945.**

Whither Agriculture

WILLIAM J. GIBBONS, S.J.

Associate Editor of AMERICA

*Reprinted from LAND AND HOME**

A N Eastern farm paper, read chiefly by dairymen, recently ran an editorial on the National Farm Labor Union. Regret was expressed that the American Federation of Labor had taken this union into its ranks and was preparing a drive for three million members. In reaching into the agricultural field, members of the American labor movement, so the editorial ran, are working against their own interests.

The reasoning behind this conclusion merits the attention of everyone concerned with the rural life movement. It is argued that unionization of farm labor means higher labor costs. These in turn necessitate increased food prices, which ultimately will have to be paid by urban industrial workers. Such a development is practically inevitable if unionization occurs in the fields. Evidently the editorial writer realizes that no labor organization would accept wage rates and working conditions prevailing in a good portion of the agricultural industry.

Urban food prices would go up in the event of wider unionization because over half the urban food sup-

ply is raised by 650,000 farms, or about 10 per cent of the total, according to the 1940 census. On these large commercial farms, hired laborers do at least half the work. Already the average increase in wages for hired workers since 1939 has been 385 per cent. Commercial farm costs have risen accordingly.

Such thinking neglects several important principles. First is, of course, that the right of organization, and consequently of unionization where the situation so warrants, is fundamental and cannot be denied just because food prices might rise as a consequence. Least of all should it be discouraged by warning urban labor that unionization by their rural fellow workers means higher food costs.

The second principle neglected is that the United States pattern of food production can and must be modified if the common good demands it. There is no reason why ten per cent of our farms should produce over half of our food. Large-scale commercial farming should at best be only tolerated. Those who venture into it must be prepared to run the

* 3801 Grand Ave., Des Moines 12, Iowa, March, 1947

risks of increased costs and of collective bargaining. They cannot enjoy the advantages of the family-type farm while their own production patterns approach those of corporate enterprises.

This question of farm labor costs and of food production for our cities and for export cannot be lightly put aside. It has national and international implications. Internationally, American agriculture cannot hope to compete in foreign markets if the price of commodities is too high. If our agricultural production is going to follow industrial patterns and depend primarily on hired labor and migrant seasonal workers, then we must resign ourselves to giving up world markets or else accept the principle of export subsidies. Under the industrial system wages are bound to be a major factor in production costs.

INDUSTRIALIZED FARMING

Domestically, the future of our family farm is tied up with the agricultural production pattern. We are steadily moving in the direction of industrialized farming, with the larger, better situated and more efficiently managed farms responsible for the major portion of the production. Compared with certain industries, e.g. automobiles and oil, where a very few firms practically control the market, agriculture is and will remain a small-business proposition. The number of producers will always have to

be large, with wide geographical distribution, for many food products do not admit of transport for long distances except at high prices. But even though the number of commercial farmers remains relatively high, if the present trend continues the total number of farms will decrease considerably. The family farm, as we have known it, could easily become the exception rather than the rule.

The tendency toward concentration and larger farm size was brought out in the January, 1947 number of *Agricultural Situation*, published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture. In 1920, only one-third of the farm land was in farms of over 500 acres. Today more than half is in such farms. Of our 1.1 billion acres of farm land, 40 per cent of it—about 460,000 acres—is in units of over 1,000 acres. Some 260,000 acres of these large units are located in 11 western States. In the West the tendency toward concentration is especially strong, but the Midwest is rapidly catching up. One-fifth of the farms in the latter region are now over 1,000 acres, an increase of thirty per cent over 1920. The number of farms under 1,000 acres is progressively decreasing almost everywhere, with those under 260 acres showing the greatest loss. With the growth of these large enterprises, the farm labor problem is bound to grow.

As against this tendency to concentrate vital food production in a relatively few large units, there is a growth in the number of so-called small farms, under 10 acres. Many of these are part-time farms on which urban industrial or office workers live. At the time of the First World War they accounted for only 5 per cent of the total number of farms. Today they account for 10 per cent. Their land area, however, is only one per cent of the total, and their contribution to urban food supply is insignificant. The only exception is the small, highly specialized type of truck farm, rather common in parts of the East, which is in reality a commercial enterprise requiring great skill.

The 1945 farm census, upon which the BAE report is based, draws our attention to the gradual disappearance of the medium-sized, family-type farm. It is the 100-260 acre group which has shown the greatest decline in numbers. While part of this decline can be explained by the fact that some farm families, including father-son partnerships, have taken over more land and have moved into a larger unit, the fact must also be faced that the number of farm units under 500 acres is also declining, while those from 500 to 1000 are practically at a standstill. Either this trend is stopped—as it well may be by strict unionization of commercial agriculture—or the family-

type farm as such is doomed. In the new type which is emerging the farm owner or manager and his family may live on the farm, but they are highly trained specialists, with a large capital investment and an increasing number of employees.

There are several reasons for this trend. Most obvious, of course, is the mechanization of American farms which has been taking place for three-quarters of a century, but has increased in pace since the First World War. Output per man-hour has so progressed that whereas 37 per cent of the nation's working force was engaged in agriculture in 1900, during the recent war only 15 per cent was thus engaged. The mechanization is by no means complete. As soon as farm machinery is turned out in sufficient volume and at fairly reasonable prices, a new era of mechanization will begin. Hope lies in the promise of farm machinery producers to develop and market power implements for smaller farm units.

Another reason for the rapid commercialization of our farms is the revolution in food transportation and processing which has been going on for the past 90 years. Before the Civil War the diversified farm, selling its excess products in local markets, was the rule. During that war "meat packing" and transport of salt-processed meat over long distances developed as an industry. Soon after

came the refrigerator car with its almost limitless possibilities for long-distance transport of meat, eggs, dairy products, fruits and vegetables. Canning and packaging grew apace. Within our own generation we have seen the sale of bulk products in retail stores almost disappear. All this has affected the pattern of food production, and consequently the nature of our farm structure.

CASH INCOME

Still another reason for increased production of cash crops and specialized farming has been the need for cash income. Ours is a money economy, and the family without a good income cannot secure health care, proper housing, and conveniences or education for its children. Whatever our future farm pattern, this need for a certain amount of cash income has to be taken into account. The unfortunate thing is that our American farmers, from being an underprivileged group with insufficient cash income, are fast becoming very money-minded. A decent family income is not enough for the upper third engaged in farming; they must make it a profitable business. Meanwhile the lowest third of our farmers are still eking out a living on submarginal or marginal farms. The middle third, for the most part, are trying to compete, with more or less success, depending on their experience and business sense, with the upper

third. Following the pattern we have seen in much of industry, the competition which now exists will progressively give way to a monopoly of a modified kind. The best trained men, helped on by technological developments which have increased farm production, will come out on the top in the new agricultural industry. They will be the farmer capitalists, as we have seen them in other countries.

The final reason for the present trend in farm size, and away from the family farm, is technological improvements. Soil-use methods, fertilizers, improved strains have pushed up output per acre. Originally intended as a means of helping our farmers produce more so they could be more prosperous, our agricultural research has actually taught them how to produce on a fewer number of acres. Today control of production by acreage restrictions is in large measure offset by increased output per acre. It is a vicious circle, with the desire for more cash income prevailing over efforts to rationalize the agricultural industry. Special-product farmers want all sorts of government assistance to maintain the prices of their own products. The general good of agriculture and of our economy and family life means little to them.

American agriculture faces a dilemma. Either the commercialization trend can be allowed to continue,

with all the inherent possibilities of "industrial" strife, monopoly, and food crises, or a determined effort is made to get back to the family-type farm, with greater possibilities of diversification, decentralization, soil conservation and preservation of human resources.

Left to itself the agricultural industry will follow the first course. In the name of freedom, opportunity and property rights, every effort of government to restrict farm size, to introduce progressive taxation, to effectively assist the smaller farmer, will be resisted. Matters will be made worse by the fact that the big farmers, who already lead the ideological war, will claim to speak in the name of all farmers, although actually the course they follow is calculated to put the "small" farmer out of business.

It is not without significance, for example, that members of the Dairymen's League, recently found guilty of rigging New York milk prices, have experienced no compunction. They see nothing wrong in what they did, according to reports in farm journals. Yet the direct effect of the rigging, had it been successful, would have been to enhance the incomes of the big milk producers and put them in a position to further influence price policy.

Other special interest farm groups make similar efforts to maintain or advance their position. Wheat and

cotton farmers, we can be sure, will exert pressure that international trade policy does not result in lowered prices for their products here in this country. This problem of keeping peace within the farm household and of prevailing upon special groups to make some sacrifice for the good of the whole economy is the logical outcome of one-crop, highly commercialized farming. Some of it is unavoidable, but by and large we are only letting the situation get needlessly worse by allowing the trend toward concentration to continue unchecked.

Since agriculture is our largest single industry, despite its decentralization among many producers, national farm policy is bound to have considerable influence upon the economy as a whole. The tensions within it, the growing competition, the frozen patterns of production coupled with the fear of surpluses, give us pause as we look ahead. The present supported prices guaranteed under the Bankhead-Jones Act and the Steagall amendments, cannot go on forever. The very continuance of parity payments, as we now know them, aggravates the situation. The biggest producers benefit most by the price supports; the little ones hardly at all. Development of new production patterns is hindered, and antiquated price relationships are frozen to a considerable extent. So far no satisfactory substitute has been suggested, and the idea of a completely

free market, without any supports or subsidies, would soon lose favor as prices dropped.

The whole problem of farm prices is closely linked to the type of production we have developed. In it costs, and consequently market prices, are of prime consideration. Yet in the face of world food needs, farmers with plenty of goods to sell cannot find buyers because costs are too high. Acreage restrictions and production controls are apparently needed to maintain prices, and the restrictions are evaded by increased output made possible through technology and mechanization. Meanwhile the world starves.

The future of the American farmer is therefore in danger. Commercialization can easily turn out to be a frankenstein. Meanwhile it will have put many of the traditional family-type, diversified farms out of business.

The inconsistencies of American farming as we know it today, should serve as a challenge to the National Catholic Rural Life Conference. The family-type farm is worth fighting for, not only for its social and moral values, but also as a stabilizer in our agricultural economy. However, if action is not taken soon on a national level, it may be too late to save this kind of agricultural production, with all its values for family living.

THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF: John LaFarge EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

PUBLISHER: Gerald C. Treacy

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph Carroll

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.